



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER,
OR A VIEW OF THE
HISTORY
AND
POLITICS
OF THE YEAR
1859.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. & F. H. RIVINGTON;

LONGMAN AND CO.; HAMILTON AND CO.; SIMPKIN AND CO.; HOULSTON
AND WRIGHT; COWIE AND CO.; J. CAPES; SMITH, ELDER AND CO.;
E. BUMPUS; J. WALLER; J. THOMAS; L. BOOTH; A. CLEAVER; UPHAM
AND BEET; BELL AND DALDY; WILLIS AND SOTHERAN; BICKERS AND
BUSH; W. HEATH; J. TOOVEY; AND J. WHELDON.

1860.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER,
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS OF PUBLIC INTEREST IN ENGLAND AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE YEAR—Parliamentary Reform and the Relations of France, Italy, and Austria—Agitation about Reform in some parts of the country—Conspicuous part taken by Mr. Bright—The public generally show little interest in the subject—Speculations on party politics—Anticipations of an eventful Session—The Queen opens Parliament in person on the 3rd of February—The Speech from the Throne—Allusion to Parliamentary Reform—In the House of Lords the Address is moved by the Earl of Winchelsea, and seconded by Lord Ravensworth—The Earl of Granville enters into a discussion of public affairs and Ministerial policy—The latter is vindicated at some length by the Earl of Derby—His emphatic declaration with regard to our relations with France and the prospects of Peace—Remarks of Earl Grey, the Earls of Hardwicke and Carlisle, and Lord Brougham—The Address agreed to *nem. con.*—It is moved in the House of Commons by the Hon. C. H. Trefusis, seconded by Mr. Beecroft—Viscount Palmerston follows with some remarks and inquiries upon foreign affairs—The Chancellor of the Exchequer enters fully on the subject of our foreign relations, expresses great anxiety for Peace, and for supporting the Alliance between France and England—Lord John Russell follows on the same subject—Remarks upon the state and prospects of Italian affairs—The Address is voted without a division. LAW OF REAL PROPERTY—SIMPLIFICATION OF TITLES—The Solicitor-General introduces two Bills for this purpose, which are very favourably received by the House of Commons—Lord St. Leonards expresses objections to the measures in the House of Lords—After some discussion in Committee the Bills are unavoidably postponed. FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Lord Palmerston brings the state of our European relations before the House of Commons and requests explanations—The Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a statement respecting the French occupation of Rome and the prospects of Europe—Lord John Russell remarks on the state of things in Italy. *The Case of the French ship Charles-et-Georges*—Debates on this question in both Houses—Speeches of Lord Wodehouse, who

moves for papers in the House of Lords, of the Earl of Malmesbury, Earl Granville, Lord Kingsdown, Earl Grey, Earl of Derby, and other Peers—The Motion is withdrawn—In the Lower House the question is moved by Mr. A. W. Kinglake, who is answered by Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald—Speeches of Mr. Lowe, Mr. Bovill, the Solicitor-General, and Lord John Russell—The Debate is adjourned, but not resumed—Discussion in the House of Lords on the Right of Search—Explanation by the Earl of Malmesbury of the negotiations between England and the United States on this subject—Remarks of the Earls of Clarendon, Aberdeen, Carlisle and Derby, and of Lord Brougham. [1

CHAPTER II.

NAVY ESTIMATES—Proposed measures to repair the deficiencies in the Naval Force of the country—Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty on moving the Estimates—Comparison between the English and French Navies—Remarks of Sir C. Wood, Sir C. Napier, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir F. Baring, Mr. Lindsay, and other members. THE ARMY ESTIMATES—Statement of General Peel, Secretary of State for War—Remarks of Sir H. Willoughby, Sir W. Codrington, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and other members. INDIAN FINANCE—Speech of Lord Stanley, Secretary for India, on this Question—Exposition of the Debt, Revenues, and financial resources of India—Lord Stanley proposes a Loan of 7,000,000*l.* to the Indian Government—Discussion in Committee—Speeches of Sir C. Wood, Sir Erskine Perry, Mr. Vernon Smith, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Lowe, and other members—Bill to authorize the Indian Loan brought in—Debate on the second reading, in which Sir George Lewis, Mr. Bright, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Wilson, Lord Stanley, Sir E. Perry, and Mr. C. Bruce take part—The second reading is carried—Observations by Lord Ellenborough on the state of the Finances of India in the House of Lords—Remarks of the Earl of Derby and other Peers—The Indian Loan Bill passed. LAW OF MARRIAGE—Viscount Bury moves for leave to bring in a Bill to legalize Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Mr. A. B. Hope opposes the Motion, which is carried by a large majority—The Bill is passed with little discussion in the House of Commons, the numbers on the third reading being 137 against 89—It encounters great objection in the House of Lords—Debate on the second reading moved by Lord Wodehouse—Speeches of Lord Dungannon, Lord Albemarle, Lord St. Leonards, the Bishops of Exeter, St. Asaph, Cork, St. David's, Oxford, and Carlisle, Lord Lifford, and Lord Cranworth—The Bill is rejected by 49 to 39. CHURCH RATES—Sir John Trelawny renews his Bill for the abolition of the Rate—The second reading is deferred till the Government have stated their intentions—Mr. Walpole proposes on the 21st February a plan for the settlement of the question—Remarks of Sir John Trelawny, Sir George Grey, Sir Arthur Elton, Sir G. C. Lewis, Lord John Russell, and other members—Leave is given to bring in a Bill—On the second reading

being moved, Sir J. Trelawny moves an amendment—Speeches of Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, Sir George Grey, Sir John Pakington, Sir R. Bethell, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Ball, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Walpole—The Amendment is carried by 254 to 171, and the Bill lost—Sir Arthur Elton proposes a series of resolutions on Church Rates, which are withdrawn after some discussion—The second reading of Sir J. Trelawny's Bill is moved on the 15th March—Mr. Griffith moves a Resolution, which is afterwards withdrawn—Mr. Hope opposes the Bill—Speeches of Mr. Deedes, Mr. B. Osborne, Mr. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Lord John Manners—The second reading is carried by 242 to 168, but the Bill is immediately postponed. ROMAN CATHOLIC OATHS—Mr. J. Fitzgerald moves for a Committee to consider the Oaths taken under the Roman Catholic Relief Act—The motion is opposed by Mr. Adams, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Spooner, and Mr. Walpole—and supported by Mr. Chester Fortescue, Lord John Russell, Mr. Maguire, and Mr. Vernon Smith—It is carried by a small majority and leave given to introduce a Bill, but no further proceedings are taken during the Session . [26

CHAPTER III.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—Expectations of the promised Ministerial Measure—On the 28th of February the Chancellor of the Exchequer states the proposals of the Government with respect to the representation of the people—His speech—Remarks of Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, Mr. Baxter, Mr. H. Drummond, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Bentinck, and other members—Leave is given to bring in the Bill. EXPLANATIONS by Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley of their reasons for seceding from the Ministry—Inclination of Public Opinion on the Ministerial Bill—The clause for disfranchising County Voters in Boroughs is much objected to—Various Notices of Amendments given by Members and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to this clause—The Debate on the second reading of the Bill commences on the 20th of March, and lasts seven nights—Lord John Russell moves an adverse Amendment—Summary of the principal speeches—The Bill is supported by Lord Stanley, Mr. Horsman, Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, Sir Hugh Cairns, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. J. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Roebuck, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Gladstone—The Amendment is advocated by Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cardwell, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Edwin James, Mr. Ellice, Sir James Graham, and other members—Upon a Division the Amendment is carried by a Majority of 39—Consequences of this Division—The Earl of Derby in the House of Lords, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons, announce that they have advised Her Majesty to appeal to the People, and that Parliament will be dissolved—Expressions of Opinion in both Houses on this announcement—The Government abandon all Measures except those of pressing importance, Votes of Supply, and the Indian Loan Bill—Debate on the Third Reading of that

Bill—Explanations of Lord Stanley, and remarks of Mr. Crawford, Sir Charles Wood, Mr. T. Baring, Colonel Sykes, and Sir H. Willoughby—The Bill is passed. AFFAIRS OF ITALY AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH FOREIGN POWERS—The Ministers meet the demand for information on this subject by giving Explanations in both Houses on the 18th of April—Speech of the Earl of Malmesbury on that occasion—Speeches of the Earl of Clarendon and Earl of Derby—The Chancellor of the Exchequer acquaints the House of Commons with the course of the Negotiations and the Policy of the Government with respect to Italy—Speeches of Lord Palmerston, Mr. T. Duncombe, Mr. Gladstone, Lord John Russell, and other Members—Parliament is prorogued by Commission on the 19th of April—The Royal Speech—The dissolution is notified in the Gazette on the 23rd, and the New Writs are issued [51]

CHAPTER IV.

THE NEW PARLIAMENT meets on the 31st May—Mr. Evelyn Denison is unanimously re-elected Speaker—The Business of the Session commences with the delivery of the Royal Speech, on the 7th of June, by the Queen in person—Her Majesty's Speech—The Address is moved in the House of Lords by Earl Powys; seconded by Lord Lifford—Earl Granville comments with great force on the conduct and policy of the Government—Speeches of the Earls of Malmesbury, Carlisle, and Eglinton, the Marquis of Normanby, Lords Howden and Brougham, the Earl of Ellenborough, Duke of Argyll, and Earl of Derby—The Address is agreed to *nem. con.*—In the House of Commons a Debate of three nights takes place—On the Address moved by Mr. A. Egerton, and seconded by Sir James Elphinstone, an Amendment is proposed by the Marquis of Hartington—The Debate turns on the Conduct of the Ministry, and is regarded as a Trial of Strength—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount Bury, Sir Charles Napier, Viscount Palmerston, Mr. Sergeant Deasy, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Mr. Bright, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Ker Seymour, Sir James Graham, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Sydney Herbert, Mr. Bentinck, the Solicitor-General, Sir George Lewis, Sir John Pakington, Lord John Russell, Mr. Roebuck, and other Members—On a division the Ministers are placed in a minority of 13—Their Defeat is followed by the Resignation of the Earl of Derby's Cabinet—Statement of Lord Derby in the House of Lords, and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons—An Administration is formed under Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister—Both Houses are adjourned for some days to fix time for the re-elections of Ministers to the vacated seats—Earl Granville, on the 30th June, states in the House of Lords what had passed in regard to the Ministerial Arrangements, and the Principles which would actuate the new Government—Remarks of Lord Brougham, the Duke of Rutland, the Earl of Malmesbury the Duke of Newcastle, and Lord Howden—Lord Palmerston makes

a similar communication to the House of Commons—STATE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCES AND APPREHENSIONS OF INVASION—Sir Charles Napier calls attention to the Deficiencies of the Navy—The Earl of Ripon, as Under-Secretary for War, states the intention of the new Government with respect to Volunteer Rifle Corps—Remarks of Lord Ellenborough, Lord Howden, and Lord Brougham, the Duke of Somerset, and the Earl of Hardwicke—Explanations of Mr. Sidney Herbert in the House of Commons respecting Rifle Corps—Remarkable Speech of Lord Lyndhurst in the House of Lords on the Danger to this Country in case of Invasion, and on the Necessity for vigorous Measures of Defence—Observations of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Earl Granville, the Earl of Hardwicke, the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Ellenborough, Lord Brougham, and the Duke of Argyll—Debate in the House of Commons on Volunteer Rifle Corps—Statements of General Peel, and Mr. Sidney Herbert—A Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Organization of the Army—THE NAVY ESTIMATES—Statement by Lord Clarence Paget, Secretary to the Admiralty, of our naval strength in the Channel—Bill to establish a Reserve Volunteer Force of Seamen discussed and carried—Important Speech of Mr. Sidney Herbert on moving the Army Estimates—Debates on the Defence of the Country—Sir de Lacy Evans moves for a Commission of Inquiry—Mr. Sidney Herbert intimates that the Government had resolved to adopt a similar step, and after some Remarks from Lord Palmerston and other Members, the Motion is withdrawn—Mr. Horsman moves a Resolution for appropriating a specific Fund to complete the necessary works of National Defence—Speeches of Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir C. Napier, Mr. Cobden, Sir John Pakington, Lord Clarence Paget, and Lord Palmerston—The Motion is negatived on a Division, by 167 to 70—Lord Lyndhurst vindicates his speech on the Danger of Invasion from the Strictures of Mr. Bright—Remarks of the Duke of Somerset—Lord Stratford de Redcliffe objects to the Suspension of the Ballot for Militia in the present state of Foreign Relations—Lord Kingsdown takes the same view—Answer of Lord Ripon on the part of the Government [97]

CHAPTER V.

CHURCH RATES—Sir John Trelawny again introduces his Bill for their abolition—Debate on the second reading—It is opposed by Mr. Du Cane, Lord R. Montague, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Packe, Lord John Manners, Mr. Disraeli, and other Members—And supported, with some qualification, by Sir George Lewis, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston—The second reading is carried—Mr. Newdegate opposes the Bill at the last stage—He is defeated ; but the measure cannot be proceeded with for want of time—In the House of Lords the Duke of Marlborough moves the appointment of a Select Committee on the subject of Church Rates—Remarks of Lord Teynham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Port-

man, the Bishop of London, and Earl Granville—The Committee is granted. *Endowed Schools Bill*.—Mr. Dilwyn moves the second reading and explains the objects of the Bill—Sir S. Northcote moves that it be read a second time that day three months—Speeches of the Attorney-General, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Walpole, Sir George Grey, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Henley—The second reading is carried by 210 to 192—The Bill is afterwards referred to a Select Committee. *Roman Catholic Disabilities*.—Sir William Somerville introduces a Bill to enable Roman Catholics to hold the office of Chancellor of Ireland—The Bill is opposed by Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Disraeli; and supported by Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, Sir George Lewis, and Mr. Cardwell—Arguments on both sides—The Adjournment of the Debate is moved and negatived; but afterwards agreed to, and the Bill is not proceeded with. *Revision of the Liturgy*.—Lord Ebury presents a Petition from a number of the Clergy, praying for a Commission—Speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Earl Powys, Lord Brougham, the Duke of Newcastle, and other Peers—The subject dropped. **FINANCE**.—On the 18th of July the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes his Financial Statement—His speech and proposals for raising increased supplies by taxes—General discussion of his plans—Mr. Disraeli, a few days afterwards, enters into an elaborate review of the Financial state of the Country, embracing a survey of Foreign Affairs—He is answered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Speeches of Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, and Lord Palmerston—The Ministerial plans of Finance are adopted, and the Bills passed. *The Indian Budget*.—Sir Charles Wood, on the 1st of August, makes a long statement of the Financial condition and prospects of India—Lord Stanley explains his views on the subject—Mr. Bright enters largely into the subject of Indian Finance and Administration. *The Indian Loan Bill*.—Discussions in both Houses on the question of an Imperial Guarantee, and on the appointment of a New Financial Minister for India—Speeches of the Duke of Argyll, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Lyveden—The Loan Bill passed. *Bill for fixing the limit of European Troops in India*.—Sir Charles Wood explains the measure, which is criticized by General Peel—Remarks of Sir de Lacy Evans, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Colonel North, Sir Frederick Smith, Colonel Sykes, Sir Henry Willoughby, and other Members—The Bill is passed . . . [138

CHAPTER VI.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS. THE WAR IN ITALY.—Statement made by Earl Granville on the re-assembling of Parliament—Remarks of the Duke of Rutland, Earl of Malmesbury, and the Duke of Newcastle—Lord Palmerston intimates in the House of Commons the views of the Government on the Italian Question—The news of the Armistice between France and Austria arrives in England, and is communicated to both Houses, then sitting, by the Ministers—Further discussions in the House

CONTENTS.

ix

Lords on the events passing in Italy—Opinions expressed by the Earl of Malmesbury, Marquis of Normanby, Earl Granville, Earl of Derby, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and other Peers. In the House of Commons, Lord Elcho postpones a motion on the affairs of Italy, of which he had given notice—Remarks made on the occasion by Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald and Lord John Russell—On the 28th of July, pursuant to notice, Lord John Russell enters into a lengthened explanation of the policy of the Government in regard to Italian Affairs—His speech—Answer of Mr. Disraeli—Speeches of Mr. Bowyer, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Drummond, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Maguire, and Lord Claude Hamilton—Further debates in both Houses on the same subject—The Marquis of Normanby raises the question of Italian policy by a motion for papers—Answer of Lord Wodehouse—Lord Elcho renews in the House of Commons his postponed motion for an Address to the Crown respecting the proposed Conference of European Powers—Mr. Kinglake moves the Previous Question—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Lord Harry Vane, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Milnes, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Whiteside, Lord John Russell, Mr. Disraeli, and Lord Palmerston—Lord Elcho replies, and declines to press his motion, which is not put—The Estimates having been voted, and various necessary Bills passed, the Session is brought to a close on the 13th of August—Parliament is prorogued by Commission—The Speech from the Throne delivered by the Lord Chancellor—Concluding Remarks [167]

CHAPTER VII.

WAR IN ITALY.—Unfriendly relations between Austria and Sardinia—Growth of Austrian influence in Italy—Treaties with Tuscany and Modena—Reception of the Austrian Minister by the French Emperor on New Year's-day—Speech of the King of Sardinia at the Opening of the Chambers—Marriage of Prince Napoleon to the Daughter of Victor Emmanuel—Circular of Count Buol to the Diplomatic Agents of Austria—Loan authorized by the Sardinian Chambers—Speech of Count Cavour—Exposition by him of Grievances against Austria—Speech of the Emperor Napoleon at the Opening of the French Chambers—Case of Sardinia against Austria as detailed by the Sardinian Government—Counter Statement of the Austrian Government—Attempts of the British Government to mediate between the Parties—Lord Cowley's Confidential Mission to Vienna—Russia proposes a Congress—Views of Sardinia and Austria on this Question—Final Effort of the British Government to maintain Peace—Attitude of Prussia . . . [188]

CHAPTER VIII.

WAR IN ITALY CONTINUED—Summons of Austria to Sardinia to disarm—Reply of the Sardinian Government—Proclamations of King Victor

Emmanuel—Views of the British Government—Suspension of the Sardinian Constitution—Statement of Count Walewski to the French *Corps Legislatif*—Address of the Emperor of Austria to his army—His Manifesto to his Subjects—Austrian circular to Foreign Powers—Proclamation of the French Commander of Rome—Events in Tuscany, Parma, and Modena—The Austrian army crosses the Ticino—Advance of the French army into Piedmont—Vindication by the French Government of its Policy—Manifesto of war by the French Emperor—The Empress appointed Regent—Policy of the British Government—The French Emperor's Order of the Day to the Army of Italy—Position of the Austrian and Sardinian armies—Military movements—Battle of Montebello—The Austrians retire across the Ticino—Battle of Magenta [15

CHAPTER IX.

THE WAR IN ITALY CONTINUED—The French Emperor and King of Sardinia enter Milan—Proclamation of the Emperor to the inhabitants of Lombardy—The Austrians driven out of Malegnano—Movements of Garibaldi—Retreat of the Austrians across Lombardy to the Mincio—Diplomatic Circular of the Russian Government—Advance of the Allied Armies in pursuit of the Austrians—Battle of Solferino—The Austrians retire upon the Quadrilateral—Armistice signed at Villafranca—Bases of Treaty of Peace—Proclamation of the Emperor Napoleon—Manifesto of the Emperor of Austria—Plenipotentiaries meet at Zurich—Disappointment of the Italians—Display of feeling at Florence—The French Emperor returns to Paris—Addresses to him, and his answers—Circular of the Papal Government—The Assembly of Romagna throws off its allegiance to the Pope—Reception by the King of Sardinia of deputations from Tuscany and Romagna—Letter from the Emperor Napoleon to the Pope [243

CHAPTER X.

CHINA—Hon. Mr. Bruce appointed Minister Plenipotentiary in China—His Instructions—Arrival at Hong Kong—Evasive delays of the Chinese—The English and French Ambassadors proceed to the Peiho river—Attempt to enter the river—The forts open fire—Disastrous failure on our part—Chinese account of the action—The British squadron returns to Shanghai.

JAPAN—Articles of the Treaty between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan.

UNITED STATES—Message of the President.

TOPICS—Slavery—African Slave Trade—China—Foreign Relations—Island of San Juan—Mexico—Refusal of Supplies—Finance [262

CHRONICLE.

EVENTS	Page 1
------------------	--------

APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

	Page		Page
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.		FINANCE ACCOUNTS	290
PROCLAMATION OF THE QUEEN to the Princes and People of India	203	PRICES OF STOCK	308
TREATIES :—		AVERAGE PRICES OF CORN, HAY, STRAW, CLOVER, AND BUT- CHER'S MEAT	309
Treaty with China	206	TABLES OF MORTALITY ; MAR- RIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS ; METEOROLOGY ; AND BANK- RUPTS	310
Treaty with Japan	216	UNIVERSITY HONOURS :—	
Convention with Guatemala	221	Oxford	311
Preliminaries of Villafranca	223	Cambridge	314
Treaty of Zurich, between Austria and France	224	TRIALS, LAW CASES, &c.	
Treaty of Zurich, between Austria and France and Sardinia	230	The Shrewsbury Estates	317
STATE PAPERS :—		The Thellusson Will Case	333
CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING		The Richmond Poisoning Case	341
THE AFFAIRS OF ITALY	236	The Poplar Poisoning Case	364
THE DEFENCE OF THE COUNTRY :—		THE MINISTRY :—	
Volunteer Reserve of Seamen	257	Of the Earl of Derby	373
Reserve Force of Seamen	261	Of Viscount Palmerston	374
Volunteer Rifle Corps	262	SHERIFFS for the Year 1859	375
Flogging in the Army	264	BIRTHS	377
Flogging in the Navy	265	MARRIAGES	389
DESPATCHES :—		DEATHS	406
The Action at the Pei-ho	267	THE GENERAL ELECTION	500
Chinese Official Account	273	HONOURS	510
LIST OF ACTS, Public and Pri- vate :—		PROMOTIONS	518
First Session 1859	276	PATENTS	528
Second Session 1859	280	POETRY	545
		INDEX	560

ANNUAL REGISTER,

FOR THE YEAR

1859.

HISTORY OF EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

Principal Subjects of Public interest in England at the Commencement of the Year—Parliamentary Reform and the Relations of France, Italy, and Austria—Agitation about Reform in some parts of the country—Conspicuous part taken by Mr. Bright—The public generally show little interest in the subject—Speculations on party politics—Anticipations of an eventful Session—The Queen opens Parliament in person on the 3rd of February—The Speech from the Throne—Allusion to Parliamentary Reform—In the House of Lords the Address is moved by the Earl of Winchelsea, and seconded by Lord Ravensworth—The Earl of Granville enters into a discussion of public affairs and Ministerial policy—The latter is vindicated at some length by the Earl of Derby—His emphatic declaration with regard to our relations with France and the prospects of Peace—Remarks of Earl Grey, the Earls of Hardwicke and Carlisle, and Lord Brougham—The Address agreed to nem. con.—It is moved in the House of Commons by the Hon. C. H. Trefusis, seconded by Mr. Beecroft—Viscount Palmerston follows with some remarks and inquiries upon foreign affairs—The Chancellor of the Exchequer enters fully on the subject of our foreign relations, expresses great anxiety for Peace and for supporting the Alliance between France and England—Lord John Russell follows on the same subject—Remarks upon the state and prospects of Italian affairs—The Address is voted without a division. LAW OF REAL PROPERTY—SIMPLIFICATION OF TITLES—The Solicitor-General introduces two Bills for this purpose, which are very favourably re-

VOL. CI.

[B]

ceived by the House of Commons—Lord St. Leonard's expresses objections to the measures in the House of Lords—After some discussion in Committee the Bills are unavoidably postponed. FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Lord Palmerston brings the state of our European relations before the House of Commons and requests explanations—The Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a statement respecting the French occupation of Rome and the prospects of Europe—Lord John Russell remarks on the state of things in Italy. The Case of the French ship Charles-et-Georges—Debates on this question in both Houses—Speeches of Lord Wodehouse, who moves for papers in the House of Lords, of the Earl of Malmesbury, Earl Granville, Lord Kingsdown, Earl Grey, Earl of Derby, and other Peers—The Motion is withdrawn—In the Lower House the question is moved by Mr. A. W. Kinglake, who is answered by Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald—Speeches of Mr. Lowe, Mr. Bovill, the Solicitor-General, and Lord John Russell—The Debate is adjourned, but not resumed—Discussion in the House of Lords on the Right of Search—Explanation by the Earl of Malmesbury of the negotiations between England and the United States on this subject—Remarks of the Earls of Clarendon, Aberdeen, Carlisle and Derby, and of Lord Brougham.

THE principal subjects which occupied public attention in England before the opening of the first Session of 1859, were the Reform of Parliament and the state of foreign politics, particularly with reference to France, Austria, and Italy. A measure for the re-construction of Parliamentary representation had been promised by the Government of Lord Derby, and the question had been largely discussed by the press and at various public meetings, chiefly in the North of England. Mr. Bright, M.P. for Birmingham, had taken a leading part in these assemblies, and had made himself conspicuous by his vehement denunciations of the existing state of the representation, and his advocacy of a large radical measure of reform. These speeches had, however, given offence and alarm to the great majority of moderate reformers, and it seemed more than

doubtful whether the zeal of the advocate had not rather prejudiced than advanced his cause. Although in certain parts of the country, and among a particular section of the population, the sweeping propositions of the popular orators found acceptance, the general mind of the nation was apathetic on the subject, and made but a feeble response to the appeals addressed to it by the ardent votaries of change. To those who remembered the keen excitement that pervaded the country in the days of the Reform agitation thirty years before, the lukewarmness and indifference of the people at the present juncture presented a striking contrast. Probably the chief interest which the question now excited was due to the effect it might be expected to have upon the relations of parties and the position of the leading competitors for political power.

On the prospects of foreign politics much uncertainty prevailed. The designs of the French Emperor in regard to Austria, and the extent of his plans for the re-settlement of Italy, were as yet shrouded in mystery. The sympathies of the people of England were unequivocally avowed. They desired to see the States of Central Italy free and independent of foreign coercion, under a government of their own choice, and they especially wished to see the abuses and mis-government of the Papal States put an end to by a complete reform of the anomalous and oppressive ecclesiastical government which had so long blighted their prosperity. Towards France and its ruler the feeling in England had undoubtedly become less cordial than in the earlier days of the alliance. Jealousy and distrust on both sides of the water had begun to undermine the friendship that had for a while subsisted between these ancient rivals; and while the imperial authority in France became by degrees more and more autocratic, the prospect of a frank and thorough accord between two nations differing so widely in their ideas and principles of policy became more problematical. The state of political parties in England afforded much room for speculation. Whether the Conservative party could continue to maintain their vantage ground in the House of Commons, despite their admitted deficiency in numbers; and whether the measures which the Derby Administration had promised to bring forth, would satisfy the demands of the Parliamentary Reformers without

alienating the less advanced section of their own party, were questions of which the solution could only be doubtfully anticipated. The expectations of those who had had most experience of political affairs, pointed to a disturbed and eventful Session, pregnant with considerable changes both in the Executive and Legislative departments.

On the 3rd of February, the Queen opened the Session in person, her reception being marked by the usual demonstrations of loyalty and attachment. Her Majesty addressed her Parliament in the following terms :—

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,—

“ In recurring, at the usual season, to the advice of my Parliament, I am happy to think that, in the internal state of the country, there is nothing to excite disquietude, and much to call for satisfaction and thankfulness. Pauperism and crime have considerably diminished during the past year; and a spirit of general contentment prevails.

“ The blessing of the Almighty on the valour of my troops in India, and on the skill of their commanders, has enabled me to inflict signal chastisement upon those who are still in arms against my authority, whenever they have ventured to encounter my forces; and I trust that, at no distant period, I may be able to announce to you the complete pacification of that great empire, and to devote my attention to the improvement of its condition, and to the obliteration of all traces of the present unhappy conflict.

“ On assuming, by your advice, the direct government of that
[B 2]

portion of my dominions, I deemed it proper to make known by Proclamation the principles by which it was my intention to be guided, and the clemency which I was disposed to show towards those who might have been seduced into revolt, but who might be willing to return to their allegiance. I have directed that a copy of that Proclamation should be laid before you.

"I receive from all Foreign Powers assurances of their friendly feelings. To cultivate and confirm those feelings, to maintain inviolate the faith of public treaties, and to contribute as far as my influence can extend, to the preservation of the general peace, are the objects of my unceasing solicitude.

"I have concluded with the Sovereigns who were parties to the Treaty of Paris of 1856, a Convention relative to the organization of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. These Rouman provinces are now proceeding to establish, under its provisions, their new form of Government.

"A treaty of commerce which I have concluded with the Emperor of Russia, and which will be laid before you, is a satisfactory indication of the complete re-establishment of those amicable relations which, until their late unfortunate interruption, had long subsisted between us, to the mutual advantage of our respective dominions.

"The measures which, in concert with my ally, the Emperor of the French, I thought it necessary to take upon the coast of China, have resulted in a treaty, by which further effusion of blood has been prevented, and which

holds out the prospect of greatly increased intercourse with that extensive and densely-peopled Empire.

"Another treaty, into which I have entered with the Emperor of Japan, opens a fresh field for commercial enterprise in a populous and highly civilized country, which has hitherto been jealously guarded against the intrusion of foreigners. As soon as the ratifications of these treaties shall have been exchanged, they will be laid before you.

"I have great satisfaction in announcing to you that the Emperor of the French has abolished a system of Negro emigration from the East Coast of Africa, against which, as unavoidably tending, however guarded, to the encouragement of the slave-trade, my Government has never ceased to address to his Imperial Majesty its most earnest, but friendly, representations.

"This wise act on the part of his Imperial Majesty induces me to hope that negotiations, now in progress at Paris, may tend to the total abandonment of the system, and to the substitution of a duly regulated supply of substantially free labour.

"The state of the Republic of Mexico, distracted by civil war, has induced me to carry forbearance to its utmost limits, in regard to wrongs and indignities to which British residents have been subjected, at the hands of the two contending parties. They have at length been carried to such an extent that I have been compelled to give instructions to the Commander of my Naval Forces in those seas to demand, and, if necessary, to enforce, due reparation.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—

"I have directed that the estimates for the ensuing year shall be submitted to you. They have been framed with a due regard to economy, and to the efficiency of the public service.

"The universal introduction of steam power into naval warfare will render necessary a temporary increase of expenditure in providing for the re-construction of the British Navy; but, I am persuaded that you will cheerfully vote whatever sums you may find to be requisite for an object of such vital importance as the maintenance of the maritime power of the country.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—

"Your labours have, in recent Sessions, been usefully directed to various measures of legal and social improvement. In the belief that further measures of a similar character may be wisely and beneficially introduced, I have desired that Bills may be submitted to you without delay, for assimilating and amending the laws relating to Bankruptcy and Insolvency; for bringing together into one set of statutes, in a classified form and with such modifications as experience will suggest to you, the laws relating to crimes and offences in England and Ireland; for enabling the owners of land in England to obtain for themselves an indefeasible title to their estates and interests, and for registering such titles with simplicity and security.

"Your attention will be called to the state of the laws which regulate the representation of the people in Parliament, and I can-

not doubt, but that you will give to this great subject a degree of calm and impartial consideration, proportioned to the magnitude of the interests involved in the result of your discussions.

"These, and other propositions for the amendment of the laws, which will be brought under your notice as the progress of public business may permit, I commend to the exercise of your deliberate judgment; and I earnestly pray that your counsels may be so guided as to insure the stability of the throne, the maintenance and improvement of our institutions, and the general welfare and happiness of my people."

The Address to the throne in answer to the Queen's speech was moved, in the House of Lords, by the Earl of Winchelsea. The noble lord congratulated the House on the suppression of the Indian rebellion, due to the firmness and sagacity of the Governor-General. He rejoiced at the treaties which the skill of Lord Elgin had brought to a successful conclusion, and alluded to the concert of the French in those waters as a sufficient proof of the *entente cordiale*. After some mention of the difficulties at present experienced in the transfer of landed property, he passed to the attacks made on the aristocracy by Mr. Bright, and made some strong remarks on the measure of reform proposed by that gentleman. It was his expectation that the Government measure would be more equitable, and one more worthy of the support of the nation.

Lord Ravensworth, in seconding the Address, expressed great sympathy with the shipowners,

whose interests were so unfortunately depressed at the present moment. He regretted the repeal of the navigation laws. After some remarks on India, he glanced at the state of affairs in Mexico, and concluded that there was no course open to the Government but to adopt the measures which they had taken for the defence of the interests of British subjects. As regarded the question of reform, he thought an extension of the franchise advisable, but repudiated Mr. Bright's idea of the landed interests of this country being represented sufficiently by the House of Lords.

Earl Granville, as leader of the opposition party in the House of Lords, next addressed their lordships. He complimented the mover and seconder both on their mode of handling the topics which they had treated, and on their judicious omission of other matters.

"Some years ago," he continued, "I had the very great honour of moving the adoption of the first Address presented by the House of Commons to Her Majesty after her accession to the throne. The seconder of the address and myself were kindly received by the Prime Minister. He communicated to us the heads of the speech which was about to be delivered, told us that he had no doubt we should admirably discharge our duty, and referred us to the heads of departments for further details which we might wish to obtain. We went to the different departments, and were kindly received by their several heads; but, somehow or other, the head of the Colonial-office thought it

would be better for us to adhere to foreign and home affairs; the Foreign Secretary thought that we had better confine ourselves to the affairs of the Home-office; while that was the only subject which the Home-Secretary thought we had better avoid. The consequence of this was, that I had to fill my short address with a topic of great interest at the time—viz., the prospect of happiness and glory during the reign which had just commenced—a promise which has been most nobly fulfilled during what we may hope is only the small portion of a long and glorious reign, the happiness of which has lately been crowned by the affectionate feelings displayed by all classes of this country, upon the marriage of the eldest daughter of the Crown, and the happy event which has lately occurred in her family; while the seconder of the address, a man of great ability, of much political knowledge and not unaccustomed to public speaking, was so entirely impressed with the subjects which he was to avoid, that, contrary to his usual practice, he entirely failed to make a speech even satisfactory to himself."

Lord Granville commented, with good-humoured sarcasm, on the omission of all allusion to the Ionian Islands, or to our relations with the United States, and the recent communications with Mr. Dallas. No doubt, he said, the noble lords had received full permission to pour a broadside into Mr. Bright, and to speak on any subject so that they did not touch upon France, Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, Germany, or Italy.

Glancing at the policy of sending Mr. Gladstone to the Ionian Islands—which had succeeded if it was hoped to retain Mr. Gladstone as a subordinate for a time—Lord Granville went on to the question of our foreign relations. Reserving the topic of the “Charles-et-Georges,” he entered upon the Italian question. There was much in the state of Italy to be deplored. All knew the kind of government that existed in Naples. Having lately returned from Rome, he could not deny that its condition must cause great grief to all who desired the welfare of Italy. It was undoubtedly the fact that the entire lay population of the Papal dominions were, almost to a man, hostile to the polity under which they now lived. Those dominions were occupied by two armies, thus disturbing the balance of power which might be dealt with by friendly diplomatic interference. Then Austria weighed heavily on the people of Lombardo-Venetia—it was not for us to consider whether those provinces were well or ill-governed; but that they belonged to Austria under public treaties which, by long continuance, had become the public law of Europe. Having described the position of Austria and Sardinia—Sardinia actuated by sympathy for the Italians, and ambition for territorial aggrandizement—he referred to the words spoken by the French Emperor to the Austrian Minister, “words that might mean everything or nothing,” and asked for an explanation from the Government. They must have some information on the subject of the probabilities of war more satisfactory than ru-

mour. What “assurances” had they received? If assurances that there is no intention of war, it would be satisfactory to know it. Ministers should clearly state their views. If they could say that during the course of these events they had spoken equally to Austria, to Sardinia, and to France, in the firm, candid, and friendly manner in which they were entitled to speak, avoiding any unnecessary or irritating menace on the one hand, but on the other declaring their steady conviction that the maintenance of existing treaties was necessary to the peace and tranquillity of the future; and if, in addition, they had entered into no engagement whatever, binding this country to take any course, at any time, other than the honour of England and the welfare of Europe, might demand,—in that case, Her Majesty’s Government would receive the hearty support of the people, a support that would enable them to speak with greater force and influence in any difficult circumstances that may hereafter arise.

The Earl of Derby congratulated the House on the substantial agreement which prevailed on all the principal topics of the Address. He believed that the present depression of the shipping interest was only temporary, and that although this particular branch of industry was not so prosperous as could be wished, yet the condition of the country at large was one of advancing prosperity. Lord Derby confirmed this conclusion by statistics, showing the decrease of poverty and crime, and the increase of the deposits in the Savings’ Banks. Passing to

foreign affairs, he observed, that in the affair of the *Charles-et-Georges*, the Emperor of the French had not fallen short of the requirements of treaties, and that Portugal had expressed itself grateful for the advice and conduct of Her Majesty's Government. With regard to the Ionian Islands, Mr. Gladstone would on his return give on account of his mission, and the result. It was not to supersede Sir John Young that Mr. Gladstone had been appointed, but, in fact, for some time past, the government of the islands had come to a dead lock. Under these circumstances Mr. Gladstone had consented to set on foot the necessary reforms, and would only remain until his successor was appointed. In referring to China the noble lord expressed his high admiration of Lord Elgin's conduct, and though appointed to that mission by his predecessors in office, he claimed credit for having introduced that nobleman to political life. Turning, then, to the subject on which Lord Granville had asked for precise explanation, Lord Derby said that he would give it plainly and unhesitatingly.

"I am fortunately," he said, "in a position to do so, because in the present state of Europe, and with respect to that portion of it which now gives just cause for anxiety, England has no separate interest to subserve, no revenge to gratify, no rankling ambition to urge her on; and above all, and I say it emphatically, because she has no secret engagement with any Power whatsoever which would interfere with, fetter, or hamper her free action. There is no question that could justify recourse to war; but

there are grounds for serious apprehension and alarm. The state of Italy is one of constant danger to the peace of Europe. But it is not in Lombardy or in Naples the greatest danger exists. Whether the Lombard provinces are a source of strength to Austria I will not say; but I will say that we have nothing to do with her internal government. They are Austrian by inheritance, possession, treaty; and neither we, nor any other nation, under any plea or upon any pretext, has a right to deprive her of them. As to Naples, that Government is repugnant and abhorrent to all our notions; but the King does not require foreign troops to put down discontent. The real plague-spot in Italy is the Papal States. The presence of two armies there, not placed to uphold liberty, is the real danger. Her Majesty's Government had pressed upon Austria and France the necessity of coming to some understanding with regard to the advice they shall tender to the Pope. It would be idle for a Protestant Government to interfere, but the best endeavours of Government will not be wanting to second the efforts of France and Austria for the amelioration of the internal administration of the Papal States." Next, Lord Derby pictured the state of Sardinia, and urged that she ought to—as she may yet—pursue a policy of internal improvement, set an example of constitutional liberty, respect treaties, and thus put the most despotic government to shame and lead it to imitate her institutions. He intimated that Sardinia would forfeit European sympathy by affording a proof

that constitutional liberty may encourage the warlike propensities of a monarch and lead him to acts of aggression. The British Government, in a spirit of sincerest friendship, had over and over again expressed anxiety on the attitude assumed by Sardinia—an attitude inconsistent with her interest and her duty. He trusted that it was not “too late” for Sardinia to reconsider the course on which she was apparently about to enter. Austria has given “the strongest assurances,”—and he believed them—that she would not interfere with her neighbours, but confine herself within her own limits to the obligations of treaties. Sardinia would be most ill-advised, therefore, to offer provocations. To no country could she look for aid but to France; and Lord Derby could not believe that the French ruler would sanction, even by moral support, still less by military means, an unjustifiable and aggressive war undertaken by Sardinia against Austria. He earnestly trusted—and would not abandon the hope—that the Emperor of the French would persist in that wise, prudent, and loyal course he had hitherto pursued. In answer to their representations, the Government had received assurances that so long as Austria confined herself to her own limits, Sardinia must not expect from France any assistance in an aggressive war. Having shown that it was the interest and the safety of the French Emperor to follow this course, Lord Derby proceeded to say, that if war should ultimately be the result, it would be a satisfaction to the Government,

though a melancholy one, that they had done all in their power, by friendly remonstrances, to prevent so formidable a calamity; and such was their position, that they were bound by no secret obligations, treaties, or understandings, but were perfectly ready to take in any contingency the course which their duty and the honour of this country might appear to require.

Earl Grey agreed with the foreign policy enunciated by Lord Derby. In reference to the navy, he observed that our safety lay in keeping a large number of sailors and officers afloat and prepared by active training for war. He deprecated the expenditure of large sums in building large ships, which became obsolete before they were wanted. At any crisis we could build ships, but could not produce trained men and officers so readily.

The Earl of Hardwicke did not agree generally with Earl Grey's views, except so far as regarded the necessity of prudence in expenditure.

Lord Brougham exposed the pretext of Sardinia in coming forward as the disinterested champion of Italian freedom, when her real intention was her own aggrandizement. He was sorry to see that Sardinia had departed from her sound and righteous policy, and hoped that the universal reprobation which had been expressed would cause her to think twice before persisting in it. The French people and their interests were averse to war. The feeling in Germany and Europe was the same. It was impossible that a war be-

tween Austria and Sardinia could be confined to Lombardy; it would become an European war.

The Earl of Carlisle, after referring to the admirable speeches made by the leaders on each side of the House, said that much of the misery of this country arose from drunkenness, and urged the Government to introduce a measure to remedy the evils now caused by the system of beer-houses—a measure which would secure for them a great and just popularity.

The Address was then agreed to without a division.

In the House of Commons, on the same evening, the Address was moved by the Hon. C. H. Trefusis, M.P. for North Devon, and seconded by Mr. Beecroft, one of the representatives of Leeds. The former chiefly dwelt upon foreign topics and strongly deprecated war. The seconder dealt with home politics and asked for a measure of reform which would be adequate without being violent.

Lord Palmerston observed that the House had seldom had greater or more important topics to deal with than on this occasion. Glancing lightly over the topics in the earlier part of the Speech he came to the Italian question. "Judging by what we are told," said the noble lord, "there is a probability of a great European war, beginning by a conflict in Italy between France and Sardinia on the one hand, and Austria on the other, the object of which will be, I presume, the expulsion of Austria from the frontier of Italy." Thence he started with the assertion that it would be desirable

for the interests of Austria and of Italy that she should not possess these provinces south of the Alps. They did not contribute to her strength, they made her hateful to many. But she possessed them by virtue of that general treaty of 1815, which was the title-deed of many other territories in Europe possessed by other Powers. It would have been better if a different arrangement had been made; but treaties ought to be respected; and no Power could be justified in attempting to dispossess Austria of those provinces. But although Austria stood upon the firm ground of right with regard to those provinces, she did not stand upon the same ground of right when she went beyond the limits to which that treaty referred; and the occupation of the other portions of Italy not belonging to her was not justified by any treaty-right which Austria possessed. Arrangements should be made for the withdrawal of the French and Austrian troops from the Papal States; Rome and Naples should adopt the advice given to them by the Great Powers in 1831, and then the tranquillity of the country would be no longer endangered. But if those Governments will not put an end to that system they must abide by the consequences.

Lord Palmerston then noticed briefly the subjects touched upon in the succeeding paragraphs, commending the measures adopted by the Government towards Mexico, and observing that the Spanish American States were prone to obey no laws but those of passion and caprice. With regard to the reform of the re-

presentation, he concluded, he said, that the passage in the Speech meant that Her Majesty's Government had a Bill prepared which they would introduce without delay, and he thought this the proper course; that it was a question which properly belonged to the responsible Government of the country.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in replying to Lord Palmerston, justified the conduct of the Government in relation to the difference between France and Portugal; and, with respect to the subject of Reform, observed that Lord Palmerston was quite right in supposing that a measure was prepared, but he would be disappointed if he supposed that it would be brought forward before the urgent business of the country was put in proper train. As to the state of relations between foreign Powers, he had no wish, he said, to conceal from the House the opinion of the Government that the state of affairs abroad was critical; but it was not a state that made them believe that the maintenance of peace was hopeless. Her Majesty's Government had taken that course which they deemed most conducive to the preservation of peace; they had communicated to France and Austria their views as to their relative positions in Italy. The cause of this uneasy state of things arose from the occupation of Central Italy by the armies of foreign Powers and the mutual jealousies of France and Austria. The British Government had pressed not only upon those two Powers, but upon the Courts of Turin, Berlin, and St. Petersburg the expediency of measures to re-

move the causes of public discontent, and had stated their conviction that this beneficial result could not be obtained by attempting to subvert the order of things established by treaty, but by the influence of those Powers being used to improve the condition of things in Central Italy itself. Although he admitted that the condition of affairs was, as he had said, critical, he did not admit that an European war was probable. He strongly urged the policy of maintaining the alliance with France—a policy, he observed, which had been pursued in past times of our history and advocated by some of our wisest statesmen.

Lord Palmerston explained, that when he inadvertently said war was probable, he only meant that war was thought likely on the Continent; but he had endeavoured to show that the sovereigns concerned were too wise to do anything of the sort.

Lord John Russell took up two main questions—the War Question and Parliamentary Reform. On the former he said he concurred entirely with Lord Palmerston, but he gave a more animated description of the repeated acts of oppression inflicted by Austria on her own and neighbouring Italian States ever since she took possession in 1815. Of this he gave many flagrant instances. It was the Austrian and French forces that imposed upon the Papal States about the worst government any country ever had. He quoted from the works of Mr. Whiteside and Lord Broughton passages in illustration of his views. His solution of the difficulty was to let the Roman people, like the Rouman people,

frame laws for themselves. They would soon produce contentment and prosperity. There was no need for a bloody war.

"You have said in the Treaty of Paris, and said most wisely, that there should be no interference in the Danubian Principalities, no interference in Servia by any foreign troops, unless all the contracting Powers of Europe are consenting parties to that interference. Now, why should we not say that with regard to the whole State of Italy—that neither in the States of the Church, nor in Tuscany, nor in Naples, shall there be any interference by a foreign force unless the Powers of Europe are parties to that interference?"

He was convinced that if the foreign forces were withdrawn, and provision were made, as it easily might be, by the Catholic Powers of Europe, for the personal security of the Pope, and if the people of Bologna and Romagna were allowed to frame laws for themselves, the difficulties of the Italian question would be speedily solved. On the subject of the proposed Reform Bill, Lord J. Russell considered the declarations of Mr. Disraeli as vague and illusive, and avowed his inability to discover any excuse for delaying the measure.

Sir John Pakington made a few observations in answer, justifying the conduct of the Government in regard to the Reform measure, and quoting as a precedent Lord John Russell's own conduct in similar circumstances. The Address was then agreed to without a division.

The first important legislative measure which the Government

introduced was a Bill to simplify the title to landed estates. This arduous subject had long demanded the attention of Parliament, and several abortive attempts had been made to remedy the expense and difficulty so long complained of in the transfer of real property; but the complexity of the subject, and the great hostility to change which prevailed in influential quarters, had hitherto thwarted all the efforts of the law reformers. The new Solicitor-General, Sir Hugh Cairns, now took up the subject, and his known ability, and the confidence reposed in him by the Conservative party, seemed to make the enterprise in his hands more hopeful than it had been found hitherto. On the 11th February the learned member moved for leave to introduce two Bills; one of which was designed to simplify titles, the other to establish a registry of landed estates. His exposition of these measures was remarkably lucid, and the reception of them by the House, without distinction of parties, was extremely favourable. Commencing his speech with a general review of the state of the law of real property, and the evils, including the depreciation of its value, owing to the want of a simplification of titles, he proceeded to consider in detail the nature of the evils, which were mainly two. The first evil attending the transfer of land was the length of time which elapsed between the making the bargain and the completion of the purchase, and the expense attending the investigation of title. The other evil was that, when the estate was bought, if money were to be raised upon its mortgage,

the same investigation was necessary, the same delay and expense were incurred, and repeated should the estate be offered for sale. These were the salient evils to which landed property in this country was exposed. In Ireland the Landed Estates Court had been empowered to give relief in the case of unencumbered as well as encumbered estates, and to give a Parliamentary title in the case of the former as well as the latter, and this change had not been found to work injustice to individuals. Looking at the facilities afforded by this Court, compared with the dilatory and expensive process of investigating titles in England, he asked why a system so beneficial to one country should not be applicable to the other, and he contended that there were no valid reasons which should deter the Legislature from applying a part of the Irish system to England. He then proceeded to give a general outline of the provisions by which, under this Bill, owners in fee simple of land, or persons having the power to dispose of the fee simple of land, and who had been in possession for five years, might come to a court and obtain a declaration of title, which should be efficacious for certain purposes. He proposed to provide a safeguard or check, not given in Ireland, enabling parties interested to lodge a caution or *caveat* in the court prior to a declaration of title. It was proposed that the Court should consist of two judges, with salaries of 3000*l.* and 2500*l.* a-year. The Solicitor-General then proceeded to explain the provisions of a subsidiary measure for a registry of titles, enabling a person having

a declaration of title to put his name on the register as the person entitled to transfer the estate, subject to any *caveat*, which might be of either of two kinds, the nature and effect of which he explained. He proposed that this registry should be in London, and that, as well as the Court, it should be to a certain extent self-supporting.

Sir R. Bethell expressed his thanks to the Government for the introduction of this measure, and the great pleasure with which he had listened to the admirable and lucid speech of the Solicitor-General. He suggested a few points for the consideration of Sir H. Cairns, warning him of the opposition he would have to encounter in the conduct of the measure, and of the difficulties with which he would have to contend.

Mr. Lowe expressed a favourable opinion of the two Bills, the introduction of which, he said, reflected the highest credit upon the Government. Mr. Malins, on the other hand, intimated some disapproval. He admitted that it was most desirable to simplify titles, but he thought that there were more practical difficulties inherent in the subject than the Solicitor-General anticipated. After a few remarks from Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Hadfield, and other members, leave was given to bring in the Bills.

Opposition of a formidable character was, however, threatened against these measures in the House of Lords. Lord St. Leonard's, whose reputation as a real property lawyer was very great, and whose attachment to the existing system was equally

strong, announced not long afterwards, his decided hostility to the Solicitor-General's measures. On the 21st of February, the noble and learned lord entered at great length into the question of the transfer of land, and criticized the Bills pending in the other House. The drift of his arguments was adverse to giving great facilities to the transfer of land lest they should strike a blow at settlements, and also adverse to the proposed grant of Parliamentary titles. In touching on the latter proposal, he described the delay that would ensue, even under the plan of the Government, amounting to at least three years in all disputed cases. In a word, he mustered up a great array of "difficulties."

The Lord Chancellor said that Lord St. Leonard's was a very great authority. Still the question of facilitating the transfer of titles and the registration of titles was not a legal question; but was a question of expediency and of social policy, on which many of their lordships were quite as competent to decide as his noble and learned friend. He deprecated discussion at that stage. Lord Brougham and Lord Cranworth made some remarks, in which they expressed a general, though qualified, approval of the proposed measures.

On the 14th of March, the Bills came on for discussion in Committee. Mr. Malins now came forward as a leading opponent of the measures, and stated his objections, many of which were of an extremely technical character, in detail. The chief difficulties which he alleged were these. The Bill, he said, will not apply to copyholds, nor to

settled estates or estates held for lives. This diminishes its value. There are few estates with bad titles. Those who have no flaw in their titles need not go to the court; those who have will not. Then the application of the Bill to unencumbered estates is new. The working of the Irish Act affords no experience. It is contrary to the principle of justice to make a judicial declaration in favour of one person in the absence of others interested. Yet that might happen under the Bill. Unless you can abolish settlements, you can never make the title to land as simple as the title to stock. A registry is to be established to register nothing, and the result of this measure will be only to incur expense.

Mr. Headlam gave his support to the measures. Mr. Bowyer gave his approval with much reserve. He thought that they would be at best only a palliative of the evils of the law and would not prove very useful in practice. Mr. Hadfield also took an unfavourable view. He objected that the Bills would not apply to small properties, would increase expense, and multiply opportunities of fraud. Mr. Walpole defended the measures with much force, and Sir Hugh Cairns ably vindicated them against the cloud of objections thrown up by Mr. Malins. Sir H. Cairns said, it was gratifying that so able a man as Mr. Malins had been reduced to minute criticisms. As to the principle of the Bill being novel, why, it was introduced ten years ago in the Irish Court, which was empowered to pronounce once and for ever whether a good title had been made out. It was said the Bill did not apply to copy-

holds. It did not; because there was a kind of registry for copyholds. It was, however, a mistake to say it did not apply to settled estates. The Bill would apply in all cases where trustees had power to sell. It did not apply to leaseholds. As a new experiment, it was best to begin with fee-simple estates. At some future time, he hoped it would be extended to leaseholds. Sir Hugh showed that great care had been taken to prevent wrong being done to absent parties, and warned the House against the arguments of terror used by Mr. Malins. He also informed the House that the solicitors had approved the general principles of the Bill. They did not desire that any effect the measure might have upon their emoluments should stand in the way of its adoption. He hoped to devise a plan of paying them *ad valorem*, instead of by length. That would be better both for solicitor and client.

Lord John Russell expressed grave doubts as to the use that would be made of the new court; and asked why a new court was necessary. Sir Hugh Cairns said that the great evil at present was, that after you had ascertained your title at great expense and delay, if you subsequently wished to deal with your estate, you must undergo all the expense and delay again. If estates were sold in lots, every purchaser required an abstract of the title. The Court would, in future, do it once for all. And to carry out the principle of the Bill there must be a new court, or none at all, seeing that its business would be wholly different from that of any court in the

country. The Judges should be more properly called "judicial conveyancers."

Sir Erskine Perry, as a warm friend to the Bills, thought their chief merit was that they created a new court. Mr. Malins reiterated his objections, which were ably encountered by Mr. Serjeant Deasy and Mr. Cardwell, who said, he saw no reason why the same practice and principles could not be applied to landed property as had been applied to stock and ships. Experience had shown, he observed, that the technical difficulties supposed to be inseparable from titles to land could be overcome. He cordially congratulated the Solicitor-General upon having had the privilege of introducing such Bills.

Some progress was made with the clauses of the Bills, but this was unfortunately the last step taken in the matter. The Ministerial crisis and the abrupt conclusion of the Session, put an effectual stop to all further proceedings in this direction, and the further progress of these valuable measures was, to the regret of all enlightened law reformers, indefinitely postponed.

A very interesting and important discussion on the foreign relations of the country occupied the House of Commons on the 25th February. Lord Palmerston took the opportunity of the motion to go into a Committee of Supply on the Navy Estimates, to question the Ministers as to the present state of affairs on the Continent, and particularly whether they were in a condition to make to the House any communication calculated to encourage the hope that there would be no interruption of the

general peace of Europe. He disclaimed any factious spirit in this inquiry, which he thought it incumbent upon the House of Commons to make. From one end of Europe to the other, he observed, there were not only great apprehensions of hostilities, but a general arming and preparations for warlike enterprizes, and it was natural to ask "What was all this about?" He considered what motives could exist for the rupture of the general peace, and could find, he said, no question among the great Powers that ought to lead France, Austria, Sardinia, Russia, or Prussia to engage in war or to violate treaties. What, then, could be the cause of these preparations? It could only be the state of Central Italy, and, if that were the real cause of the jealousy and differences between two great Powers, the only way to calm them down was by a mutual and simultaneous retirement of both France and Austria from the Papal States. If this was the true cause of difference—and he was unable to see any other—the Government of Great Britain was in a position of being able, by the exercise of its good offices, to render a most important service to Europe, and to avert the evils of a general war. If a good and enlightened Government were established at Rome the bulk of the people would be content. He ventured, therefore, to submit that Her Majesty's Government might, by negotiation, obtain from Austria and France an engagement to retire from the Roman States, and procure those political improvements in them and the lesser States of Italy that would secure the future

tranquillity of that country. At all events, if the attempt were made and proved unsuccessful, Great Britain would stand acquitted.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer was not surprised that Lord Palmerston, as the leader of the Opposition, should have made this inquiry, and acquitted him of the possibility of his being actuated in making it by party feelings. The state of public affairs, he admitted, justified the inquiry. It was notorious that military preparations were going forward in various parts of Europe, and he concurred in the view taken by Lord Palmerston of the position of the Powers interested in the settlement of 1815. It was not the interest of any of those Powers to disturb that settlement, and he believed it was not their wish; but there were circumstances which created an anomalous state of affairs with reference to Italy which might occasion war, although the object at the commencement might not be a desire to challenge or impugn the settlement of 1815. Her Majesty's Government, he observed, had not been altogether idle. They had endeavoured, to the best of their ability, to take that course which they deemed most conducive to the maintenance of the general peace. He had the satisfaction of informing the House that they had received communications which gave them reason to believe that before long the Roman States would be evacuated by the French and Austrian troops, and this with the concurrence of the Papal Government; and that Lord Cowley, who enjoyed the entire confidence of Her Majesty's Go-

vernment, had repaired to Vienna on a confidential mission—one of peace and conciliation. In conclusion, Mr. Disraeli, deprecating the effects of a debate in that House upon this delicate topic, urged the postponement of discussion for the present, assuring the House that every effort would be made on the part of the Government to maintain the general peace only on principles consistent with the dignity and welfare of Europe.

Lord John Russell congratulated the House upon the statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, after a few remarks upon Italian affairs, joined in his recommendations to the House to refrain from any further discussion of the subject.

Debates upon a case in which our foreign relations were much involved took place a few nights afterwards in both Houses. The question had reference to the differences between France and Portugal in the case of the French ship *Charles et Georges*, and to the part which the British Government had taken in the dispute. The correspondence between Lord Malmesbury and the French Government having been laid before Parliament, Lord Wodehouse, on the 8th March, called the attention of the House of Lords to the question involved in it, and especially to the part acted by the English Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He said that on a calm review of all the circumstances, he thought their lordships would agree with him that of the three States which were engaged in this question, England remained in the most unsatisfactory position. Portugal had nothing to regret in the

VOL. CI.

course she took. She had maintained throughout her own dignity and honour. France, if she had incurred the reproach of having compelled a weaker State by force to yield to her demands, had at least, in the words of Count Walewski, acted as she thought best suited her own honour, and had not been deterred by any fear of consequences from pursuing her own course. To England alone remained the discredit of having drawn Portugal into a course of policy by which she came into conflict with a stronger Power, and then abandoning an old and faithful ally. He concluded by moving that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty for a copy of the telegraphic despatch of the 16th of October, 1858, referred to in Mr. Howard's despatch of the 27th of October to the Earl of Malmesbury.

Lord Malmesbury thought that the Government ought to be judged by the facts which they had at the time, and not by those which became subsequently known to them. When first introduced to the notice of the Government, the case was so full of contradictions that it was impossible to decide whether Portugal was entirely right, and could justify the measures she had taken. The complaints of the Portuguese Government were two—first, that the municipal law had been violated, and secondly, that the vessel was engaged in the slave-trade. The first was subsequently dropped. The French Government met these complaints with counter-statements, so that Her Majesty's Government had no data on which to arrive at a decision as to which of the parties

[C]

was in the right. He explained the steps he had taken, and the correspondence he had entered into with Lord Cowley on the subject, and repudiated the charge of delay and negligence brought against him by Lord Wodehouse. The principle laid down by the French Government, that a vessel with a French agent on board, who was responsible to his Government, is no longer to be treated as a private ship, was in accordance with international law, and he insisted that if such a vessel violated any municipal law, it was not a case for the ordinary tribunals, but for diplomacy. In consequence of Lord Cowley's representations, the French Government gave a positive assurance that an arrangement would be come to, by which the mediation of a friendly Power would be allowed. If the French Government recoiled from their assurance, that was not a reason for blaming Her Majesty's Government. In regard to the advice tendered to the Portuguese Government, he asserted that Mr. Howard was right, and observed that the treaties, which it had been said, we had failed to fulfil, had never been appealed to by the Portuguese, and that a *casus fœderis* had not occurred. He did not regret the course he had pursued, for he was sure it had saved the country and Europe from the most serious consequences.

Earl Granville thought that Her Majesty's Government had not dealt fairly either with Portugal or France in this matter. He had no doubt that France was in the wrong, but considered she had been much irritated by the conduct of the Portuguese Go-

vernment. The instructions sent to Lord Cowley were not sufficiently definite; they ought to have been more positive. The Portuguese Government had done, with one exception, what it was their duty to do, and had exhibited as strong a sense of honour as the greatest nation which exists. Having alluded jocularly to the conversation which had taken place between Lord Malmesbury and the French Ambassador, he asked in what part of these papers the French had laid down the principle, that the presence of a French delegate on board the ship, gave an official character to the *Charles et Georges*. It was a principle with which he could not agree. He thought this transaction would leave a most unfavourable impression, not only on this country, but on the whole of Europe and the civilized world, and would prove that the Government had not shown either the requisite activity or judgment.

Lord Kingsdown would confine himself to the law of the case, for it was by the rights that might or might not exist on the part of the French Government that Her Majesty's Ministers must be judged. He considered the principle that a ship with an agent on board responsible to his Government was amenable or not to municipal law, and decided that by no means could she be brought under it. Now, Count Walewski had stated that the agent on board the *Charles et Georges*, was a delegate appointed by the French Government, so that the question immediately fell into the hands of diplomatists. He thought that the Portuguese Government had, by its

own rashness, involved itself in great peril, from which they had been extricated by the prudence and forbearance of Lord Malmesbury.

Earl Grey said the French Government knew well that it was contrary to Portuguese law to export negroes from the Portuguese African possessions, for much correspondence had taken place between the French and Portuguese Governments on the subject. The Portuguese Government was informed by France that the system of procuring negroes from the Portuguese dominions should be abandoned. Subsequently to this, French vessels were detected carrying on the trade, and he thought that the Portuguese Governor, in looking to the correspondence which had taken place, was warranted in supposing that difficulties might arise unless he acted with vigour. Under these circumstances the *Charles et Georges* was seized and condemned. He admitted the principle that a ship acting under the authority of a State is not subject to the municipal law of a foreign country; but denied that there was a single despatch in which the French Government put forward that claim in the case of the *Charles et Georges*. France only asserted that the presence of her agent ought to have exempted the vessel from the suspicion of being engaged in the slave-trade. Moreover, there was no evidence to show that the ship had any claim to a public character. There was every reason to believe the Portuguese claim was right, but supposing it doubtful, there was a clear case for reference. He thought the Go-

vernment ought to have presented a formal note to the French Government, stating that there were serious grounds for thinking that France might not be entirely in the right. No man had a greater horror of war than himself, but he did not think that the best way of securing peace was to abandon an ally for too faithfully following the advice we gave her; nor did he think so ill of the Emperor of the French as to deem that a firm remonstrance from this country would have produced war. He felt convinced that if the facts of the case had been properly represented to the Emperor, the difficulty would never have arisen. The conduct of the Government in this matter had sensibly lowered this country in the opinion of Europe.

Lord Derby said the mover of the question ought to have called on Parliament to pronounce a verdict against a Government, which had so grossly neglected its duty, if he thought the course pursued by the Government had lowered its character in Europe. He objected strongly to the view of the question that had been adopted by some persons, that we had incited Portugal to suppress the slave-trade, and had deserted her, when she had exerted herself to follow our counsels. That was not the question. The question was, whether the Government, under the circumstances, had done their duty to the country. We were obliged to allow the right of France to carry on a traffic, which, under the name of free immigration, was inseparably connected with the slave-trade. The Government represented to the French Em-

[C 2]

peror the difficulties likely to arise from this traffic, and the French Government had adopted a course honourable to itself and humanity. He denied that any violation of our treaties with Portugal had occurred, a circumstance which had been allowed by the Portuguese Prime Minister himself. The reason why we had not sooner interfered was that the matter in dispute did not touch this country, as it was a difference between two independent countries, neither of whom asked for our interference; and because they had not furnished us with information on which to form a judgment. The French Government had asserted that the ship was French, and that she carried a French delegate. This had not been denied, and in this case she ought to have been given over to the French Government. But supposing the Portuguese claims to be true, they had not taken, according to their own confession, the course which they were bound to take. The good offices of the Government had been tendered to Portugal immediately that she had applied for them. He rejected the course of action prescribed by Lord Grey, of remonstrating with the French Government before they were convinced that France was in the wrong. He repudiated the notion that we had submitted to an insult, or had fallen in the estimation of Europe. He thought the course adopted by Her Majesty's Government had convinced France of the unsoundness of the system of free immigration, and that this country had come forth with honour to itself and advantage to the interests of Europe, and, unless Parliament should con-

demn the conduct of the Government, he should be content with the course pursued.

After a few remarks from Lord Cranworth, Lord Wensleydale, and Lord St. Germans, the noble mover withdrew his Motion.

The debate on the same subject in the House of Commons was commenced with an elaborate speech by Mr. A. W. Kinglake. The honourable member premised by saying that it was not his intention to cast blame on any foreign potentate, or to raise any question involving our relations with foreign States. The question was purely domestic,—whether the manner in which the negotiations had been conducted by the Foreign Secretary had been such as the House approved,—with firmness, and a due attention to existing treaties, and other obligations not less sacred? He glanced at the treaties between this country and Portugal; the result, in his opinion, was to bind England to aid Portugal in any just cause; and he then considered the arrangements between the two States regarding the slave-trade. Having determined these preliminary points, he gave a summary of the facts contained in the papers, bearing upon the character of the vessel and its human cargo, its seizure and condemnation at Mozambique, and the feeling thereby excited in France. On the 6th of March, 1858, the Foreign Secretary was informed of the claim of France for restitution of the vessel; and the proposition he (Mr. Kinglake) maintained was, that from that day until the month of October, Lord Malmesbury, thinking this a grave affair, involving the safety of an ally,

nevertheless took no steps, though the claim of France was of a startling character, and it was his duty to inquire into the merits of the case, and to make proper representations to France. The total inaction of the British Government continued until the 25th September, when Lord Malmesbury began to speak of friendly offices, which were promised, but nothing was done until the 30th, when there was the first approach to anything like good offices on the part of England, and in October her intervention ceased to be of use. This total inaction for seven months was followed by efforts which Mr. Kinglake censured as unwise and dilatory; he believed, in his conscience, he said, that, if the Emperor of the French had been asked to submit the question to arbitration at any time before October, he would have consented. There was no proof that Lord Cowley was an active negotiator in the transaction; Lord Malmesbury took a course entirely his own, and Mr. Kinglake severely condemned a suggestion made by him with the view of furnishing a loop-hole for getting out of the difficulty. The terms recommended to Portugal, and which Lord Malmesbury had termed "an amicable settlement," she rejected, and had maintained her honour, not by adopting but by resisting the counsels of an English Minister. He concluded by moving for further papers.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Buxton, who dwelt upon the ill effects likely to flow from the course taken by the British Government in the transaction, and its want of decision and vigour.

Mr. S. Fitzgerald, after noticing

an antagonism between the views of the mover and seconder, expressed his concurrence in the argument of the former, that a British Minister was bound to see that treaties were observed in the letter and spirit of their obligations. The question, he observed, was not whether the French Government or the Portuguese Government were in the right, but whether the conduct of the British Government had been right. The accusation against them was, that they had not acted with perfect fidelity to the letter and in the spirit of treaties, and had not shown with due energy the sympathy due to an ancient ally in a misunderstanding with France caused by the urgency of the British Government itself. No one had asserted that we ought to have supported Portugal right or wrong, and Mr. Kinglake had not pretended that we were called upon to act upon our treaties with Portugal. Having examined the Portuguese case, and pointed out its defects, which, he said, prevented the British Government from saying that the French Government was wrong or that of Portugal right, he asked what course in such a case Her Majesty's Government could take. The only course was to refer the whole question to some third party, and that, he asserted, was the course actually taken by them. He read extracts from the papers in confirmation of this assertion, and to show that the good offices of the British Government were not only promised, but exerted, and that Lord Cowley took an active part in the negotiations. It was not until the 3rd of October a despatch from Lord Cowley, received on the 4th, in-

formed his Government that the question was assuming a dangerous aspect, and on the 13th, only nine days after, the whole matter was brought to a satisfactory and amicable conclusion by the active exertions of the British Government. After recapitulating his proofs, he observed that, if the charges of Mr. Kinglake were true, his motion was a strange one. If half of them had any foundation, the occupants of the Treasury bench ought no longer to sit there; but Mr. Kinglake had thought he fulfilled his duty to the country, having preferred such a formidable indictment, by moving for papers. In a moment of doubt, embarrassment, and difficulty, the Government, he contended, had taken the course best calculated to preserve unimpaired the honour of both France and England, as well as the peace of Europe.

Mr. Lowe disputed many of the positions of Mr. Fitzgerald, contending that the ground had totally failed him. In replying to Mr. Kinglake he had left out all the essential points. The real issue before the House was what Lord Malmesbury did. The *Charles et Georges* was convicted, he observed, as a slaver, and he cited facts to show that she was justly convicted. He contended that the British Government were bound, without loss of time, to have made up their minds whether this was a case of slave trading or not, and, if Portugal was in the right, to have advised her as to the course she ought to pursue. No definite course was recommended to her, however, but one of dishonour. Referring to what had been done by Lord Malmesbury, the question, he

said, was whether he had done what he ought to have done, and whether he ought not to have done more. He maintained that he ought to have done more, and he asked on what principle a Government could be justified in a case like this in standing aside without the courage to give an opinion of its own.

Mr. Bovill complained of the terms in which Mr. Lowe had spoken of Lord Malmesbury, whom he defended against the charge that he had shrunk from the performance of his duty. He insisted that the *Charles et Georges* had not been condemned simply for slave trading, but for infringing fiscal regulations, and he questioned whether the vessel was ever within the jurisdiction of Portugal. If so, the French Government were entitled to demand her restitution. He contended that there was no clear and distinct statement or admission in the papers from which our Government were bound to conclude that the vessel was within the Portuguese jurisdiction. Then the presence of a French delegate on board placed the vessel, by the comity of nations, within the scope of diplomacy. The proceedings at Mozambique were not such as, by the law of nations, the French Government were bound to respect, and there were other irregularities in the case which Mr. Bovill pointed out from the papers, and which, he said, cast a doubt on the legality of the seizure. Such a state of circumstances disabled the British Government from acting upon the treaty in the material support of Portugal. He did not approve the conduct of France in this matter; and he proceeded to consider

the question on the principles of international law. If breach of treaty was charged, he asserted that Portugal had never complained, and our good offices, required by the treaty, were not only not withheld from Portugal, but were volunteered. The result of the policy recommended by Mr. Lowe would have been a *casus belli* with France, and the plunging of the whole of Europe in war.

Lord J. Russell said, he did not wish to take an exaggerated view of this question. He must say that a great deal was to be said on behalf of the Government, and that our Minister would have been quite wrong to advise Portugal to resist by force of arms the demand of France, violent as it was, and thus expose Europe to the risk of war. The question was, therefore, not one for censure; it was one for comment and criticism on the mode in which the negotiations had been carried on. In his opinion, this was one of those doubtful cases, in which the honour of two States was concerned, and which, under the protocol of Paris, should have been submitted to arbitration; and if the English Government had had influence with its ally, and Lord Malmesbury had spoken firmly and in conciliatory language, he would, he believed, have been listened to by that ally. He thought it was owing to the manner in which Lord Malmesbury had conducted the case that it had not been referred to a third Power. This was proposed by Count Lavradio, and the proposition should have been supported by all the influence of this country; instead of which, Lord

Malmesbury was all through suggesting that Portugal must be in the wrong, and that she should yield. The worst result of the correspondence was the disposition which the French Government had shown to adopt the spirit of the protocol of Paris, and he feared that the Government of this country had not at Paris that influence which it ought to have.

The Solicitor-General, after some passing criticisms upon the speeches of Mr. Lowe and Lord J. Russell, observed that the right of Portugal to demand assistance from England depended upon the treaty of 1703, and Portugal had not applied to this country under that treaty, because no *casus fœderis* had arisen. But, supposing a *casus fœderis*, the Power to which the treaty applied was bound by international law, before interfering, to see if the ally was right or wrong: He then showed that doubts existed as to the case of Portugal, and that there were circumstances in it which withdrew it from the cognizance of the municipal courts, and transferred it to that of diplomacy. That principle was adopted by us in the recent case of the Cagliari. The main point was, whether the Government of this country and Lord Malmesbury had exerted all their power to accommodate matters between France and Portugal; and he showed that our good offices were tendered unasked, and that Lord Cowley had proposed to Count Walewski to refer the matter to the arbitration of a friendly Power, and when that proposal was rejected, he immediately proposed a mediation. This being

likewise refused on the 10th of October, on that day Count Lavradio arrived on the scene, and new negotiations were commenced, in concert with Lord Cowley, which ended in an arrangement a few days afterwards. In conclusion, he summed up the results of the correspondence, and insisted that Her Majesty's Government, using the valuable services of Lord Cowley, had from day to day exerted their good offices with France in favour of Portugal.

The debate, upon the motion of Sir Richard Bethell, was now adjourned, but owing to the sudden termination of the Session, it was not resumed. The only remaining occasion in this Session on which the subject of our Foreign relations came under the notice of Parliament, was a brief discussion on the right of search, and the negotiations on that subject undertaken by Her Majesty's Government, which originated in a request addressed by Lord Wodehouse to the Foreign Secretary, that he would lay the correspondence with the American Minister before Parliament. The noble Lord in the course of his remarks referred to a despatch of General Cass, in which, without proposing any plan of his own, that officer had said, that no right of search to verify the flag would be permitted.

Lord Malmesbury had no objection to lay the correspondence before the House. It would then be clear that he had not surrendered any British privilege. The right of search arose at a time when our navy was irresistible, and was the only navy that could suppress the slave-trade.

But the right of search was not founded on right, and was unsupported by international law. As soon as France had rebuilt her navy she refused our right of search, and America followed her example. We had held out too long. But, if we had been inclined to run into one extreme, the Americans had run into the other; for they had denied that any such right of verifying the flag existed. That opinion had been subsequently modified, for General Cass had explained that a search might now and then be justified, but it must always be at the risk of the searchers, and that when exercised fairly, no Government could complain. He informed the House that an identical code of signals had been established between the French and English Governments, which he hoped would be adopted by the United States. Assurances had been received from the United States of a sincere desire to suppress the slave-trade, and a proposal for adopting a more efficient system had been forwarded from America. After alluding to the frank manner in which the French Government had given up the free immigration system, he said that the best hopes for suppressing the slave-trade consisted in the maintenance of peace, and that the strongest assurances of the permanence of peace had been received from France.

The Earl of Clarendon denied the position that either the late or the former Government had claimed a right of search in time of peace. Such a course would be contrary to international law. He thought that we ought to have some means of verifying

the nationality of vessels. But, whatever code was adopted should be universal, and not confined to the three chief maritime Powers.

The Earl of Aberdeen read a despatch which he had written when at the head of the Foreign Office twenty years before, which showed that the principles then laid down were those acted upon by former Governments and were not new.

The Earl of Carlisle thought that the principles so laid down were just, and he hoped that the identical code of signals would be adapted as early as possible.

The Earl of Derby observed

that no one contended that this country or any other had a right to board a ship, but the right to ascertain the nationality was not disputed. He hoped that some understanding would be come to between the French, British, and American Governments, as to the mode of verifying the nationality of vessels.

Lord Brougham remarked upon the absurdity of the doctrine that no cruiser had a right to stop a vessel, unless she bore the same flag.

The discussion then terminated.

CHAPTER II.

NAVY ESTIMATES—*Proposed measures to repair the deficiencies in the Naval Force of the country—Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty on moving the Estimates—Comparison between the English and French Navies—Remarks of Sir C. Wood, Sir C. Napier, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir F. Baring, Mr. Lindsay, and other members.* **THE ARMY ESTIMATES**—*Statement of General Peel, Secretary of State for War—Remarks of Sir H. Willoughby, Sir W. Codrington, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and other members.* **INDIAN FINANCE**—*Speech of Lord Stanley, Secretary for India, on this Question—Exposition of the Debt, Revenues and financial resources of India—Lord Stanley proposes a Loan of 7,000,000*l.* to the Indian Government—Discussion in Committee—Speeches of Sir C. Wood, Sir Erskine Perry, Mr. Vernon Smith, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Lowe, and other members—Bill to authorize the Indian Loan brought in—Debate on the second reading, in which Sir George Lewis, Mr. Bright, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Wilson, Lord Stanley, Sir E. Perry, and Mr. C. Bruce take part—The second reading is carried—Observations by Lord Ellenborough on the state of the Finances of India in the House of Lords—Remarks of the Earl of Derby and other Peers—The Indian Loan Bill passed.* **LAW OF MARRIAGE**—*Viscount Bury moves for leave to bring in a Bill to legalize Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Mr. A. B. Hope opposes the Motion, which is carried by a large majority—The Bill is passed with little discussion in the House of Commons, the numbers on the third reading being 137 against 89—It encounters great objection in the House of Lords—Debate on the second reading moved by Lord Wodehouse—Speeches of Lord Duncannon, Lord Albemarle, Lord St. Leonards, the Bishops of Exeter, St. Asaph, Cork, St. Davids, Oxford, and Carlisle, Lord Lifford, and Lord Cranworth—The Bill is rejected by 49 to 39.* **CHURCH RATES**—*Sir John Trelawny renews his Bill for the Abolition of the Rate—The second reading is deferred till the Government have stated their intentions—Mr. Walpole proposes on the 21st February a plan for the settlement of the question—Remarks of Sir John Trelawny, Sir George Grey, Sir Arthur Elton, Sir G. C. Lewis, Lord John Russell, and other members—Leave is given to bring in a Bill—On the second reading being moved, Sir J. Trelawny moves an amendment—Speeches of Mr. Sotherton Estcourt, Sir George Grey, Sir John Pakington, Sir R. Bethell, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Ball, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Walpole—The Amendment is carried by 254 to 171, and the Bill lost—Sir Arthur Elton proposes a series of resolutions on Church Rates which are withdrawn after some dis-*

cussion—The second reading of Sir J. Trelawny's Bill is moved on the 15th March—Mr. Griffith moves a Resolution which is afterwards withdrawn—Mr. Hope opposes the Bill—Speeches of Mr. Deedes, Mr. B. Osborne, Mr. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Lord John Manners—The second reading is carried by 242 to 168, but the Bill is immediately postponed. ROMAN CATHOLIC OATHS—Mr. J. Fitzgerald moves for a Committee to consider the Oaths taken under the Roman Catholic Relief Act—The motion is opposed by Mr. Adams, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Spooner, and Mr. Walpole—and supported by Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Lord John Russell, Mr. Maquire, and Mr. Vernon Smith—It is carried by a small majority and leave given to introduce a Bill, but no further proceedings are taken during the Session.

THE increase and improvement of the Royal Navy was one of the objects to which the attention of Parliament had been directed by the Royal Speech, and in the unsettled state of European politics, the impression had become general that the maritime defences of this country had been too much neglected, and that our Navy had been reduced to a degree inconsistent with national security. Public opinion had consequently become favourable to an increase of ships, and a more efficient mode of manning them, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, Sir John Pakington, had directed his attention with much zeal to the improvement of this branch of the service. An increased demand on the public resources was a necessary result of these measures, and when it devolved on the First Lord to move the Navy Estimates in the House of Commons it became his duty to afford to Parliament a fuller exposition than usual of the measures which the Government had adopted, and of the requirements for which large additional funds were required. He stated that the total estimate

amounted to 9,831,181*l.* against 8,851,377*l.* for the year 1858-59; the increase being required for the purpose of placing the Navy in a more efficient state. He went through the principal items of increase with explanatory comments, particularly remarking that there were at present only four docks in Her Majesty's yards capable of holding our largest ships, and that five others were to be enlarged so as to adapt them for that purpose. No less a sum than 4,000,000*l.* had been spent within the last few years upon marine engines for the Navy; and in order to secure a good future supply at proper prices, it was in contemplation to extend the sphere of competition, while other steps would be taken to economize dockyard expenditure generally. With regard to the number of men which the House was asked to vote, it was larger than had been demanded for many years past; for though nominally but 3000, it was actually nearly 7000 more than the number for last year. There was in reality no Channel fleet last year; but the Admiralty had since created one of six sail of the line, five of which were first-

class vessels, while others were being put into commission, which would give us a Channel fleet of eight screw ships of the line, and five heavy screw frigates. This he thought would be sufficient for all requirements; but if more became necessary, no doubt the House would cheerfully vote them. In addition to manning these vessels efficiently, in order to prevent future delays in the manning of ships, and also for the purpose of training our seamen to the practice of gunnery, it was intended to maintain a reserve of 3000 men.

The French navy was superior to the English in screw liners and frigates. He proposed to add fifteen screw liners and nine heavy frigates to the fleet by the conversion of sailing vessels and the construction of new ones. This would be done in the course of the next year. Two iron-cased ships would also be built on the best principles to place us on a par in that respect with France. There was not, however, room to build these ships in the government yards, and they would therefore be built by contract. Thus the navy would be augmented during the year with 26 powerful ships. Less he could not ask, and more could not be accomplished in consequence of the crowded state of the dockyards. He, for one, would not be satisfied until larger additions were made to our fleet. He moved that the number of men, boys, and marines for 1859-60 should be 62,480.

Sir C. Wood reviewed the statement of Sir J. Pakington, expressing his satisfaction to find that the alarm which the House had felt, at the beginning of the

the session, on the announcement that he was about to "reconstruct" the Navy, was groundless. He offered no objection to the vote, nor to the proposal to increase the number of vessels, though he did not concur in the mode in which it was to be increased. He should desire a permanent addition to the establishment of the dockyards.

Sir C. Napier observed, that the House would never refuse to sanction a necessary increase of our Navy if the money was properly expended; but he contended that the money was not properly expended. He gave an alarming description of the naval power of France, which, he said, commanded the Channel at the present moment, and this was not a position for this country to be in.

Sir J. Ephinstone urged attention to the condition of seamen, and the necessity of raising the *status* of the inferior grades of the service. He complained of the deficiency of docks for the reception of the Queen's ships.

Mr. Sidney Herbert said that Governments were always afraid of proposing heavy estimates on account of the opposition they were certain to receive; illustrating his opinion by a reference to his own experience when Secretary of War. During that time he said he had the greatest possible difficulty in obtaining the most moderate estimates for a service which it was now acknowledged was far below the mark in point of efficiency.

Mr. Whitbread thought Sir J. Pakington censurable for having, with the knowledge in July of the comparative inferiority of our Navy, nevertheless concealed the

fact from the House of Commons. He pointed out defects in our naval administration which he attributed to the backwardness of Boards of Admiralty to come to that House for votes of money.

Admiral Walcott denied that we had lost the command of the Channel, and so long as we kept it, he thought there was little danger of invasion.

Mr. Bentinck objected strongly to the constitution of the Board of Admiralty. So long as the head of that Board was a civilian, liable to be frequently displaced, it was impossible that there could be an efficient system of naval administration.

Sir F. Baring agreed that it was our duty to keep a-head of foreign navies. This, however, cost a great deal of money, and it was the duty of the House of Commons to examine closely into our naval expenditure. He suggested the appointment of a Committee for this purpose.

After some remarks from Mr. Lindsay, Admiral Duncombe, and Lord Clarence Paget, the vote was agreed to.

The Army Estimates were moved by General Peel, on the 4th of March. The gallant officer began his statement by explaining certain apparent discrepancies, arising from the sums to be accounted for by the East India Company. The amount to be voted was 11,568,060*l.*, against 11,577,755*l.*, the amount of the estimates of last year. There was an apparent decrease, he observed, in the number of men, which appeared to be 7480 less than that of last year—namely, 130,135—whereas the number to be actually voted this year was only 122,655. But there

was an increase in the East India establishment, the force of which was this year 106,902. The grand total of Her Majesty's land forces was 229,557 men. In the course of his explanations as to the general character of the estimates, General Peel gave some interesting details respecting the improvements in the artillery and Armstrong's guns. He concluded by moving the first vote, of 122,655 men for the service of the United Kingdom.

Sir H. Willoughby asked for information regarding the payment of the troops in this country destined for India, and whether the artillery of India was to be supplied from this country. He noticed the heavy demands which the present military expenditure would make upon the Indian finances, and that it was a serious question whether so large an expenditure should be made out of the Indian Exchequer not under the control of Parliament.

Mr. Sidney Herbert bore testimony to the improvements that had taken place in the army, and thought that the estimates, though large, could not at this time be safely reduced.

Sir W. Codrington strongly urged the defects of our recruiting system, and the want of sufficient inducements to enter the service, so that in a time of pressure, the supply required could not be obtained. The same gallant officer expressed his approval of the suggestion to teach the middle and lower classes the use of the rifle. Mr. H. Buckley and Mr. W. Williams concurred in this recommendation. After a variety of criticisms on sundry details the votes were agreed to.

On the 14th of February, Lord

Stanley, the Secretary of State for the affairs of India, made a long and elaborate statement to the House of Commons upon the financial state of that country—a subject which was then exciting much interest, and some anxiety, in the public mind. The exhaustion occasioned by the mutiny—the great loss of property and revenue—and the very heavy charges incurred by the military operations, had produced a great excess of expenditure and deficiency of revenue, and it was feared that the void thus created would have to be made good, sooner or later, out of the resources of the British tax-payer. On this account, the official statement of the Minister for India was anticipated with much interest, and was listened to with great attention by the House of Commons. The noble lord began by giving an outline of the financial state of India during the last two years compared with that of the preceding two years. The total revenue in the years 1856-57 was, he said, 33,303,000*l.*; the expenditure 33,482,000*l.*, showing an apparent deficiency of 179,000*l.*; but this expenditure included a large sum laid out upon objects which came under the comprehensive title of “public works,” but for which there would have been a considerable surplus. The deficiency, which in the year 1853-54 was 2,100,000*l.*, was, in 1854-55, 1,700,000*l.*; in 1855-56, 1,000,000*l.*; and in 1856-57, as before stated, only 179,000*l.*, showing that, at the time of the outbreak of the mutiny, the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure was nearly restored. The accounts for 1857-58 had not been received; but the estimated

revenue was 31,544,000*l.*, and the expenditure 39,129,000*l.*, showing an estimated deficiency of 7,600,000*l.*, besides the extra expense for troops and stores, amounting to 1,500,000*l.*; so that the total deficiency in the year 1857-58, in round numbers, amounted to 9,000,000*l.* The estimate for 1858-59 was—revenue, 33,016,000*l.*; and expenditure, 45,829,000*l.*, showing an estimated deficiency of 12,800,000*l.*, to which if the deficiency of 1857-58 be added, the total deficiency of these two years since the mutiny was 21,600,000*l.*, in which no account was taken of the compensation for the loss of private property.

Lord Stanley then proceeded to explain the sources of revenue. The sum derived from land had grown with the growth of our possessions. In 1856-57 it yielded 19,080,000*l.*; fell to 16,671,000*l.* in 1857-58; and rose again to 18,592,000*l.* in 1858-59. This item was of slow growth. It could only increase, where there were permanent settlements, from the cultivation of new lands, and was therefore comparatively inelastic. Another source of increase was additions of territory, of which we might hope there would be no more just at present. The increase from the cultivation of waste lands was a probable source of great wealth, but no prudent financier would calculate upon making it available in a short time. Next to land revenue, which yielded 60 per cent., was opium, which yielded 20 per cent. This source varied with the crop, and the demand of the market. In 1857, the opium revenue was 4 696,709*l.*; in 1857-58, it rose to 6,443,706*l.*; and in

1858-59 fell to 5,195,191*l*. Objections had been raised to opium as a source of revenue, but there was no plea for the prohibition of opium culture that might not be equally urged in favour of the Maine Law in England. As regards the monopoly, the Government were considering whether they could substitute an excise. The other sources of revenue were salt, yielding 4,398,960*l*. in 1857-58, and a variety of miscellaneous items yielding, in round numbers, about 3,000,000*l*.

These facts showed that increased prosperity in India did not produce the same results upon revenue as in England. Under native Governments taxes were levied upon almost every action of a man's life, and all classes paid more equally than at present, when, excepting the salt duty and a few customs duties, the mercantile classes paid no taxes. Now it was more difficult to impose a new tax on India than on England; the Home Government had, therefore, not given special directions to the Indian Government in this matter, but had suggested the subject for mature consideration, and expressed an anxious desire that no unnecessary check should be placed on works of public improvement. Diminished outlay was the only present resource we could look to. The deficiency of 21,600,000*l*. was wholly due to military expenses arising out of the mutiny. Those expenses had risen from 11,546,000*l*. in 1856-57, to 18,212,000*l*. in 1857-58, and 22,598,000*l*. in 1858-59. Our expenditure might be diminished by employing uncovenanted servants, and substituting cheap Native for comparatively costly Eu-

ropean agency. The salaries of the civil servants might bear revision, but hardly reduction, seeing that the rates of remuneration were relatively as great in the service of the railway companies, for example, as in the Government service. But when peace was restored, the policy of annexation being abandoned, railways being developed, our latest acquisitions becoming more settled, we should not require a larger force in India than we had before the disturbances. At present the European force in India (91,590) was nearly double what it was in 1857, and the Native force (243,956) exceeded that of 1857 by 11,732.

Lord Stanley next referred to the public debt. Compared with the revenue there had been little increase in the debt since 1800. Then the debt was 16,600,000*l*., and the revenue was 9,200,000*l*.; now the debt was 74,500,000*l*., the revenue 33,000,000*l*. This sum was held by natives in the proportion of two-fifths, by Europeans in the proportion of three-fifths. The amount raised by loan since the mutiny broke out was 19,814,000*l*. It was worth notice that, whereas in 1800 the interest paid was $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it was now on an average only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. When it was considered that the whole of this debt had been incurred in a constant series of wars, the wonder was that it was not larger. Hitherto, this debt had been held to be a charge only on the Indian Exchequer; the Government would recommend no change of policy; but looking to the fact that more than 50,000,000*l*. had been contributed by English capitalists, it was worth considering how far England could repudiate

the debt without shaking her credit. It must be remembered that India now paid more for interest than she would pay if she had the assistance of England. It was matter of doubt whether practically we were free from responsibility. With regard to the future, he thought there were in India great materials of prosperity. Her imports had more than doubled; her exports had nearly doubled within the last twenty years; the tonnage entering and leaving her ports had also nearly doubled; the export of cotton had augmented from 352,000,000 lbs. in 1842, to 863,000,000 lbs. in 1857. The trade of Calcutta had increased one-half; the trade of Bombay had doubled in five years. In three years there would be 3100 miles of railway in operation; irrigation works were in progress in Madras; harbour works at Calcutta and Kurrachee; an electric telegraph would stretch as far towards India as Aden by next June. In order to facilitate railway enterprise, the Government would appoint by competition a special engineering service for India. Experience had shown that some public works returned profits so enormous, that they not only covered their own cost but repayed the expenses of the less successful.

Lord Stanley touched on the land tenure, and intimated that Government lands would be opened to European colonization on the principle of selling absolute ownership in the soil—a boon long demanded by Europeans; while it was proposed that Native Zemindars might also acquire, by paying a commutation of the land tax, the fee-simple of the land,

free of future charge. The sums thus obtained for land were to be applied to the extinction of debt. In connection with the land tenures were the “*Enam*” Commissions of inquiry. The operation of these had been much misrepresented. The object was not to disturb titles, but to confirm them—to give what in this country is called a Parliamentary title, but at the same time to detect frauds. Precautions would be taken to prevent these proceedings from being harsh to individuals.

In conclusion, Lord Stanley asked the House to authorize a loan to the Government of India of 7,000,000*l.* The course he proposed to take respecting this loan was the same as last year, it being intended that the loan should be secured upon the revenues of India specifically. He had great hopes that, although for a time the deficiency might continue, it would not be necessary for a long time to come to raise any further loans for India.

A general discussion of these matters took place a few nights afterwards in Committee. Lord Stanley took occasion to explain at the outset a discrepancy between some of the figures which he had stated and certain papers which had been laid before Parliament relating to the finances of India. This discrepancy was partly owing to his having taken the rupee at 2*s.*, whereas in the Parliamentary papers it was taken at 1*s.* 10½*d.* He believed that his own value was nearest to the truth. The amount of debt he had stated was quite correct—including the home debt, as well as that raised in India, the total was 74,534,000*l.*

Sir C. Wood, premising that

he intended to offer no opposition to the loan, entered very copiously into the general financial state of India, of which he drew a gloomy picture. He strenuously urged the inexpediency and impolicy of this country undertaking the pecuniary liabilities of India; but, if we wished to avoid them, we must, he observed, be exceedingly cautious in dealing with Indian revenue and Indian expenditure. He noticed the disproportionate increase of the latter, and, in considering the future prospects of the revenue, he thought that there was, at present, a prospect rather of a reduction than of an increase in the land revenue, while that derived from opium was variable and precarious. The Chinese, having legalized the importation of opium, might sanction its cultivation in China, a measure which would seriously affect the Indian revenue. He discussed the modes suggested by Lord Stanley of keeping down the expenditure, by reducing the salaries of the European servants, and by a more extensive employment of natives. To the latter expedient he offered various objections; and, upon the whole, he was of opinion that the civil expenditure was more likely to increase than diminish. The military establishment was the only branch of the expenditure in which any material reduction could be made; but upon this point Lord Stanley had given the House no information, though it was evident that we must be prepared for a considerable increase of the European force in India. His calculation of the Indian liabilities exceeded that of Lord Stanley; including the present

VOL. CI.

loan, he believed they amounted to 90,000,000*l*.

Sir Erskine Perry took an equally gloomy view of the subject. He regarded the present state of the finances of India as alarming. The Indian debt, properly speaking, amounted, he said, to 110,676,955*l*., which, taking the net revenue at 23,000,000*l*., was a very large debt, being more than four years' revenue. He insisted that the Indian Government should be compelled to make the expenditure and the revenue balance each other. He advocated, upon political as well as economical grounds, the larger employment of native functionaries, and the creating a property in land, to be given to European settlers as well as natives. He was hopeful of India, under a good Government, with a native agency.

Mr. Liddell defended Lord Stanley's statements against the criticisms of Sir C. Wood.

Mr. V. Smith complained that the House had no results before it; that Lord Stanley had held out nothing upon which it could form an opinion. Lord Stanley, he observed, had omitted in his statement compensation for losses of property, which must be extremely large. He (Mr. Smith) had, however, better hopes of the elasticity of the Indian land revenue than either Lord Stanley or Sir C. Wood, and he believed that fresh taxes might be levied. The civil expenditure might, in his opinion, be diminished, but, as a large European force must be maintained in India for some years, he did not see how there could be a reduction of the military expenditure. He trusted that in the re-construction of a

[D]

native army there would be no native artillery.

Mr Crawford gave some details respecting Indian railways, showing that they were already highly remunerative. He threw out suggestions regarding the financial operations of the Indian Government, and thought too great stress was laid upon the possible diminution of the opium revenue. China, he said, was not a country where opium could be profitably grown to any great extent.

Mr. Campbell, with reference to railways in India, hoped the time was coming when the system of guarantees would be at an end. He hoped that the stipulation in the Loan Act of last year, providing that the pecuniary burdens of India should be borne by the Indian Exchequer alone, would not be departed from; that India when it borrowed money should borrow on its own security.

Sir H. Willoughby suggested that the Bill authorizing this loan should contain a clause of appropriation, confining it to specific purposes.

Mr. Lowe observed that, as Lord Stanley admitted he saw no prospect of increasing his ways and means and of diminishing his expenditure, there must be a constant deficiency in the Indian finances. The House had, therefore, a right to expect from him the suggestion of measures of relief. Means might be taken to bind the people more closely to us, which would enable us to reduce our military force in India. Land in that country failed to perform the functions it discharged everywhere else, because our land revenue system and onerous assessment left no property in the land. He protested

strongly against the system of guarantees.

Lord Stanley briefly replied to the questions and objections that had been started. He explained what he had said on the former occasion with reference to the responsibility for the debt of India and to the possible contingencies under which the Imperial revenue might become liable for it.

The second reading of the Loan Bill having been moved on the 6th of March, some important speeches were made on that occasion.

Sir G. Lewis said, he was not one of those who placed much reliance upon the Indian revenue, or upon the national wealth to be derived from India, and it was important that we should not exaggerate the value of our Eastern possessions. But as we had destroyed the Native States, and entered into engagements with that country, it was incumbent upon us, and a paramount obligation, to carry on its government. When the form of that government was altered last year, and a worn-out constitution was put an end to, although the change was a wholesome one, he cautioned the House against supposing that it implied any alteration in the financial management of India, or imposed any additional obligation upon the Imperial Exchequer, the severance of India from the Imperial Exchequer being as entire in future as before the Bill of last year. After reviewing the enormous military expenditure in India—the great incubus of Indian finance—and the means of reducing it by our paying a part of that expenditure, he observed, that if we were to lend assistance to India, no means could be more

objectionable than that of guaranteeing an Indian loan. What he wished to impress upon the Government was, to take the earliest means of endeavouring to reduce the force of the Native Army, and to rely upon a system of police, to be substituted as far as possible for a Native Army. This would afford a better hope of improving the finances of India than any attempt to pare down salaries. He did not expect that this country would derive advantage from the good government of India, from which the natives would reap the benefit; nevertheless, its misgovernment would entail upon us most serious consequences, and it was the duty of Parliament to enforce a good financial administration in India, and compel the adoption of measures that would offer a certain prospect of the revenue of that country being sufficient to meet its expenditure.

Mr. Bright adverted to the speech of Lord Stanley upon introducing the Bill, which gave, he observed, a discouraging picture of the prospects of the Indian revenue, and he declared he saw no likelihood of improvement; there was no check upon the expenditure of that revenue, which was suffered to run out like water. There was every probability of an annual falling off of the revenue, and of a fresh Loan Bill every year. This state of things did not, he said, arise from the recent revolt; the system of a constant deficit existed before the revolt, which only aggravated the previous state of things. What, then, was to be done? He suggested the reduction of the salaries of the Civil Service of India, and either the employment of a much larger number of Europeans in

certain departments, or the giving much better salaries to a superior class of native officials. Moreover, with a better government in India, a small military force would suffice. He urged the reversal of the present system of policy in India—the establishment of something like municipal institutions there—and the admission into our councils and the incorporation with the Government of the best and most intelligent of the natives of India. He insisted that nothing like a change had taken place in the administration of India since the Bill of last year; that the change was only in name; it was scarcely one of form, and none of principle. He was convinced that the course we had pursued had led, by a logical and necessary process, to the position in which we now found ourselves, and that unless that system was reversed, we might have another great revolt, with consequences most disastrous to this country.

Mr. Ayrton did not take a disheartening view of the Indian finances, and assigned reasons for believing that when the means of communication were complete, which would be in a few years, there would be such an increase in the land revenue as would render it quite equal to the charge. He considered the proposition of Sir G. Lewis, that there must be an entire separation between the Indian and the Imperial treasuries, wrong in principle and impracticable. He recommended the Government of this country to borrow money in this country at $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., and lend it to India at a rate of interest that would insure the repayment of the principal in fifteen or twenty years. He suggested vari-

[D 2]

ous reforms in the details of the Indian Government; he gave a qualified assent to Mr. Bright's proposal to admit the natives of India to a participation in the Government, and, with him, in order to keep down expenditure, recommended the reduction of the salaries of civilians.

Mr. Ewart expressed his difference of opinion from Mr. Bright, in respect to the development of the resources of India. He expected from the improvement of the means of inter-communication, a great expansion of the revenue.

Mr. Wilson had not only no apprehensions as to the financial prospects of India, but he had the greatest hope of them. Almost every increase of the Indian debt had arisen from wars, and from expenditure upon public works which would be reproductive. If the increased interest upon the Indian debt were taken at 2,000,000*l.* and the expenditure upon public works at 1,000,000*l.*, and there should be a deficiency of 3,000,000*l.*, he should not despair of seeing in the next three or four years such an increase of the revenue from existing sources as would enable the Government of India to bear this charge. He disputed some of the conclusions of Mr. Bright regarding the land revenue of India; he condemned the policy of alienating in perpetuity waste or jungle lands, as repeating the error committed by Lord Cornwallis in his Permanent Settlement; and he justified the views of the late and former Governments in relation to railways in India, and to certain branches of the Indian revenue. He did not anticipate a falling off in the revenue derived from either salt

or opium. He disapproved an Imperial guarantee of an Indian loan; he believed that the future rule of England over India was more secure than ever, and did not fear for the resources of the latter country.

Lord Stanley made a general reply. He believed, he said, that when the resources of India were properly and fully developed, the expenditure would not be greater than they would bear. Although he admitted that the amount of the Indian debt exhibited an actual increase, he repeated that, relatively to the amount of the revenue, there had been no increase. As to the salaries of the civil servants, what could be saved in that direction, he remarked, would be insignificant compared with the military expenditure. With regard to what had been said of a supposed Imperial guarantee of this loan, he fully allowed that the Indian creditor had no claim whatever except upon the Indian revenues. What he had said on a former occasion was, that the Indian creditor having the first claim upon those revenues, if they should prove insufficient to defray the civil and military expenditure, a question would arise as to the ultimate responsibility.

Sir E. Perry observed that all the best authorities now agreed that, under present circumstances and present prospects, the finances of India presented an alarming aspect. Was India able to bear the burdens cast upon her? If not, and if this country would be ultimately responsible, it would be wiser and more economical to raise the money at once upon the credit of England.

Mr. C. Bruce said, upon the

question of the liability of this country for the Indian debt, he concurred in the opinion expressed by the late Sir Robert Peel in 1842, that, if the credit of India became disordered, that of England must be brought forward to support it. Upon every principle of equity, when the Government of India was assumed directly by the Crown, it was taken with all its liabilities, and a possible contingent liability could not be repudiated.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The same subject was at a later date brought under the notice of the House of Lords by the Earl of Ellenborough, who, on the 25th March, moved for copies of all the notifications that had been issued by the Governor-General relative to raising money on loan from the commencement of 1857 to the present time. The noble Earl then entered, in his usual forcible manner, upon the general question of Indian Finance. He began by commenting on the continued fall of public securities in India since the beginning of the year. This unparalleled depression was not, in his opinion, to be attributed to political difficulties, but to the mode in which the Indian Government had attempted to raise money. So great had these difficulties become, that it was reported that the salaries of Government officers in Oude had not been paid, but only that part which was called subsistence money. The embarrassments of the Indian Government had been increased by the depreciation of former stock in endeavouring to raise fresh loans. It was stated

that in raising a loan at $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. they had allowed the holders of 4 per cent. stock, in subscribing to the new loan, to pay the 4 per cent. stock in at par. The steps the Government of India had taken to remedy these evils had been totally inadequate, and they had at last reached that point when it was absolutely necessary for the Government of this country to come to their assistance. He thought Her Majesty's Government would have been justified in asking for means to raise 12,000,000*l.* at once instead of only 7,000,000*l.* He thought that this course must ultimately be adopted, and hoped to hear a confirmation of his views from Her Majesty's Government. It struck him, however, as strange that, after all we had heard of free trade, in buying money we always contrived to do so in the dearest market.

Lord Derby regretted that the Indian finances were not so prosperous as could be wished, and confirmed the lucid and accurate statement of Lord Ellenborough. In respect to the question of open loans, he had great doubts as to their propriety, for he thought nothing could be more objectionable than keeping up an open loan of indefinite amount at a specified rate of interest. He was sorry to inform the House that it would be necessary to ask Parliament this Session for power to raise a further sum for Indian purposes. He proceeded to explain the correspondence which had taken place between the Governor-General and Her Majesty's Government on the subject of these financial difficulties, and observed that a

deficit of 11,500,000*l.*, in round numbers had to be provided for. Deducting 1,000,000*l.* that would shortly be forwarded to India, there would remain 10,500,000*l.*, which would be further reduced by another million from a reserve fund of 12,000,000*l.* This would leave 9,500,000*l.*, which the Governor-General proposed to reduce to 8,000,000*l.* by imposing a slight tax on imports, stamps, and home-grown tobacco. These 8,000,000*l.* were to be paid off by the help of a loan in India of 5,000,000*l.*, and the Governor-General looked to this country to forward 3,000,000*l.* in addition to what had been already forwarded. Under these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government had come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to ask for leave to raise a further sum than the 7,000,000*l.* at first contemplated. What the exact sum would be he could not yet say; it would be at least 8,000,000*l.*, and perhaps 5,000,000*l.* This was exclusive of prize money and compensation. Looking to the effects of railways in India, he concluded that the gloomy state of Indian finances would soon assume a brighter hue. As to the report about the retention of salaries of officers in Oude he had received no information. The only information he had received was, that the Indian Government intended to raise a $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. loan. He deprecated any attacks on the Government because they had not at once asked for the whole of the sum since found to be necessary, as it was impossible for the Government then to foresee the present demand.

A few other peers took part in

the discussion, among whom were the Marquis of Clanricarde, Lord Montagu, and the Earl of Albemarle, and the motion was agreed to.

The India Loan Bill, being a matter of great urgency, was one of the small number of measures which became law during the brief Session which preceded the dissolution.

The precarious tenure of the present Parliament did not, however, deter Viscount Bury from renewing the attempt unsuccessfully made in former Sessions to legalize marriages with a deceased wife's sister. The noble Lord presented a measure for this purpose to the House of Commons on the 16th February, and moved for leave to bring it in.

Mr. A. B. Hope appealed to the noble Lord whether, at this period of the Session, when there was so much business before the House, it was desirable to take up its time by such a motion as this. He entered his emphatic protest against the measure.

After a short discussion the House divided, and gave leave to introduce the Bill, by a majority of 155 to 85.

It underwent but little debate in the House of Commons, the subject having been pretty well exhausted by repeated arguments in former Sessions. On the third reading it was again vehemently opposed by Mr. Hope, who declared his resolution to give to that measure an "undying, undeviating, and unmitigated opposition," a protest which created some merriment in the House. The third reading was carried by 137 to 89, and the Bill was passed.

But the most formidable opposition to the measure had always been in the House of Lords, and on this occasion the dissentients again prevailed. On the 22nd of March Lord Wodehouse moved the second reading of the Bill. He begun by adverting to the progress that had taken place in public opinion upon this question. He pointed out how those of the clergy who conscientiously objected to perform these marriages were not compelled to do so by the present Bill. As to the religious question, he would only say that, after a careful examination, the verse in Leviticus was, he thought, in favour of those who supported the Bill. He then passed to the opinions of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of St. David's, and the Bishop of Manchester, who had expressed themselves strongly in favour of the Bill; and, as last year only seven of the Bishops voted against it, he inferred that the opposition would not be very strong on the present occasion. He denied the principle that because a man and wife were made one flesh by marriage the relationship extended to the whole wife's family. He then proceeded to consider the Bill on social grounds, and thought that the ordinary objections made against the Bill on account of the disturbance it would create in family relations were groundless. He proceeded to observe that in Germany, the United States, Switzerland, and to some extent in Russia, these marriages were permitted. When the principle was so widely acknowledged by other nations, ought we not to take into consideration the propriety of altering the law? In

order to maintain the present system an imperative necessity for it ought to be proved, and he did not think this had been or could be done.

Lord Dungannon moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months. He objected strongly to the Bill, as tending to destroy all the most sacred relations of social life. He denied that these marriages were either desired by or prevalent among the poorer classes. As to the argument that these marriages were legalized in foreign countries, he thought the House ought to remember that they were legislating for English men and women. He had also heard that some countries in which these marriages were legal were considering the propriety of further relaxing the law in that respect; and, if so, ought we not to think seriously before we proceeded to alter a law which when in force elsewhere had been productive of much evil? He thought that the feelings of the gentler sex ought to be considered. Not one woman in 50 was in favour of this Bill, as was manifest from the numberless petitions signed by women all over the country. He asked them, in the name of the women of England, and for the sake of preserving the moral purity of English homes, not to legalize these marriages, which had for 1500 years been contrary to the canons of the Church, and which would, if legalized, make one law for the Church and another for the country.

Lord Albemarle thought the chapter in Leviticus showed clearly the erroneous grounds on which the canon referred to had been founded. He voted for the

measure because he thought it would prevent gross immorality on the part of the poor.

The Bishop of Exeter regretted that from his age he was incapable of taking a prominent part in this discussion. In answer to the list of Bishops cited by Lord Wodehouse, he asked how many Bishops had there been from the beginning of the Church against it? He should oppose the Bill solely on religious grounds, and maintained that it was solely a religious, and not a social question.

Lord St. Leonard said that the measure of 1835 had sufficiently shown what the intention of Parliament was in regard to these marriages; and if that were so, people who contracted them did so fully aware that the ceremony was illegal, and the issue illegitimate. He asked, why was Scotland omitted from the Bill? Why, too, should Ireland be excluded? A worse Bill was never submitted to the House. By this Bill, if an Englishman married his sister-in-law, the marriage, although good in England, was not good in either Scotland or Ireland. And what, then, became of the rights of property, succession to peerages, and other rights that depended on the validity of marriage?

The Bishop of St. Asaph expressed his belief that these marriages were forbidden by the law of God in the same sense and upon the same grounds as polygamy was forbidden. By the law of God affinity was placed in the same position as consanguinity. Under the Levitical law woman was a chattel to her husband, and therefore polygamy existed; but our Saviour repealed

the Mosaic law, and placed wives upon an equality with their husbands. If this Bill were passed there was nothing to prevent polygamy being practised in this country.

Lord Lifford supported the Bill, as required to remedy a great social evil. He knew a case in which a pious person, connected with their lordships' House, had, in compliance with the request of his dying wife, married her sister. He knew another case in which a poor man had, at the request of his dying wife, contracted a similar marriage. There was also another case in the higher ranks of life, in which a dying wife placed her hands in those of her husband and of her sister, and implored them, for the sake of her children, to marry each other as soon as this cruel law should be repealed.

Lord Cranworth opposed the Bill. He thought that the feelings of the women of England, who, he believed, were generally opposed to the change, ought to be considered. He distrusted the assertion that the poorer classes were anxious for such a measure. Persons who had had experience of the poor, by visiting among them, had assured him that there was no desire for such marriages among them. He conjured their lordships not to pass a measure which, he believed, would be attended with great social evils.

The Bishop of Cork contended that there was no Divine prohibition against the marriages in question. He did not think that we were bound by the enactments of the Levitical law, and the true

interpretation of the text relied upon by the opponents of the Bill did not point to marriage with a wife's sister, but to illicit intercourse.

The Bishop of St. David's thought that, without relying on the particular words of the passage in Leviticus, the prohibition against these marriages came clearly within the spirit and tendency of the law of Christ.

The Bishop of Oxford asserted his firm belief that the marriages in question were distinctly prohibited by the 18th chapter of Leviticus, that that prohibition rested on moral grounds, and was of perpetual obligation. If the Levitical prohibitions were discarded, what restrictions, he asked, upon marriage would exist? He denied that the poorer classes desired to contract these unions; and he argued that the effect of relaxing this restriction would be most injurious to the morality of the country. If this licence were once granted, they could not stop at this point. Was it possible to open the flood-gates, and then to say, "You shall go no further?" On what principle, if this point were once yielded, were further concessions to be resisted? Why should not a man be allowed to marry his step-mother? If the law of God did not prohibit it, what law did? All these prohibitions rested on the law of God. The law of nature was not a bit stronger against marriages of consanguinity than against marriages of affinity, and if once the law of God were broken through, on what a sea of impurity would the domestic happiness of the country be launched!

The Bishop of Carlisle took an

opposite view of the construction of the passage in Leviticus. He considered that the prohibition was limited by the words "during her life." With regard to the desire for this measure on the part of the poor, he cited cases from his own experience as a parochial minister. He could give instances, but, of course, it would not be proper to give names. In his own parish he had known people of the upper middle classes married within those degrees well received; and, so far from the families being unhappy, he had never seen happier families, or families better brought up, in his life. Small shopkeepers, under the same circumstances, had asked him to marry them, and he had been obliged to refuse, because so long as the law remained it would be immoral to break that law. They and he, whatever might be their private opinions, had to submit to the ordinance of man for the Lord's sake. He had seen cases among the extreme poor; and no sooner had he left the parish than it became his painful duty to urge a clergyman in his diocese to vacate his living because he had married his deceased wife's sister.

After a reply from Lord Wodehouse their lordships divided, when there appeared:—

Contents	. . . 39
Non-Contents	. . . 49

—

Majority against second reading . . . 10

The Bill was therefore lost.

The settlement of the long-pending Church-rate controversy was again attempted in the present Session, two Bills having been introduced for that purpose,

the first by Sir John Trelawny, for the total abolition of the rate, the other a more complex scheme, prepared by the Government, and introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. Walpole. Sir John Trelawny's Bill, being the same in form as had passed through the House in a former Session, was brought in by the honourable baronet on the 8th of February, and read a first time. The Government offered no opposition; but it was understood that the second reading should not be pressed until the Government measure was before the House.

At the same time Mr. Alcock introduced a Bill to provide for the voluntary commutation of Church-rates.

On the 21st February Mr. Walpole made the statement of his measure to the House, which he prefaced by saying that he was about to propose, on the part of the Government, what he considered a just, moderate, and reasonable settlement of this question, which he believed to be the only practicable mode of settling it. The law as it stood, he observed, was plain and clear: it imposed an obligation upon the parishioners of every parish to maintain the fabric of the parish church. On the other hand, he did not deny that the law had its inconveniences, arising from the changes wrought by time and circumstances. Premising that these rates were a charge upon property, or upon persons in respect to property, from time immemorial, he proceeded to examine the results exhibited by the returns of 1852 and for the present year, whence it appeared that, while in 10,000 parishes the amounts contributed towards

church fabrics by rate and by voluntary aid were nearly equal, the greater proportion of the landed proprietors liable to church-rates were churchmen; showing, he remarked, that the plea of conscience was not a strong plea. He then reviewed the various schemes which had been proposed from time to time to remedy the grievance complained of under the existing law, including the proposition of Sir G. Grey and that of Mr. Puller, pointing out the objections to which they were all, in his opinion, more or less liable. The result was, he observed, that Parliament should reject all plans which would transfer the charge from the property now liable to it to property not at present liable; or which attempted to throw the obligation upon the public taxation of the country or upon the revenues of the Church; and that it should set its face against all plans which, like that of Sir W. Clay, attempted to substitute for a legal obligation, payment by means of pew-rents. The Government proposed to make the rate a landlords' rate; to enable the owners of land to charge it with a church-rate, extending the power to tenants for life as well as owners in fee; to make incumbents and churchwardens corporations; and to make provisions (which he explained) for aiding this rent-charge by voluntary assistance. By this proposal the legal obligation which rested upon property to answer a debt to which it was justly liable was not abandoned. In order to relieve conscientious scruples, provisions would be made to exempt Dissenters from the rate; but persons

claiming exemption upon such a ground would not be permitted to take part in vestry meetings for imposing a church-rate. In conclusion, he said he proposed this plan, believing from his heart that it was a just, fair, and reasonable settlement of this complicated question, and, having done so, he left to the House the merit of adopting or the responsibility of rejecting it. He moved for leave to bring in a Bill embodying the plan.

Sir J. Trelawny acknowledged the conciliatory tone adopted by Mr. Walpole, but required time to consider the measure more fully.

Sir George Grey could not express an opinion upon the plan until he saw the Bill in print, to which he was prepared to give a fair and candid consideration. He drew conclusions from the returns somewhat different from Mr. Walpole's, and did not quite agree with him on the subject of pew-rents.

Mr. Ball considered Mr. Walpole's proposal a very fair one; it came in such a shape that he was much disposed to accept it.

Sir Arthur Elton regretted that Mr. Walpole had not boldly at once put an end to church-rates, which, in his opinion, would have quickened voluntary contributions and benefactions, even in the lower strata of society. He approved the exclusion of Dissenters from vestry-meetings upon church matters.

Sir G. C. Lewis said he agreed that the House should be in full possession of the plan of the Government before discussion; and he therefore asked whether it was intended that the present vestries (consisting of occupiers), should cease, and the vestries

in future should consist of land-owners, and what would be done where the property was held by more than one landlord.

Lord J. Russell said he thought the measure was framed in a most conciliatory spirit; but, with respect to that part of it which relieved from the payment of church-rates those who had conscientious scruples, it seemed to him that it changed the character of the Church of England, and did not maintain it as a national Church. It had always appeared to him that the whole case of the Established Church was that it was for the general advantage of the community at large; that the placing a minister of the gospel in a parish was a benefit, not only to Churchmen, but to those who dissented from the Church; and the practical effect of making a distinction between the two would be to keep alive ill-blood in parishes.

Mr. Mellor asked what would be done with regard to those towns where church-rates were not now levied. The discussion upon the general question of church-rates was continued by Mr. A. B. Hope, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Alderman Cubitt, Mr. Hadfield, Sir B. Bridges, and Mr. Ker.

Mr. Walpole replied to questions and objections. It was the intention of the Government, he said, not to interfere with the existing law unnecessarily, and therefore to leave the law unaltered in respect to the places referred to by Mr. Mellor. In cases where the landlord paid the rate, the tenant's vote in the vestry would be transferred to him.

Leave was then given to bring in the Bill. The second reading being moved on the 9th of May.

Sir J. Trelawny moved to postpone it for six months. If the voluntary principle was to be relied on at all, he observed, his own Bill carried out that object simply, and he contrasted that measure with the Bill under consideration, his objections to which, its provisions and its whole scheme, he detailed at some length, contending that it had a tendency to perpetuate church-rates, and even to revive them, with all their discords and litigation, in parishes where they had ceased.

The amendment was seconded by Mr. Hardcastle, who observed that the time for a compromise had passed, and that, if not, Mr. Walpole's scheme was the worst form of compromise.

Mr. S. Estcourt remarked that the House had now the advantage of a choice of measures, based upon different principles, which they could compare. The Bill of Sir J. Trelawny, for the abolition of church-rates, was a rough way of dealing with the question. The proper mode was to ascertain what were the grievances complained of, and to devise suitable remedies; and he proceeded to consider the inconveniences and hardships of the present system as respected clergymen as well as Nonconformists, and the manner in which they would be obviated by Mr. Walpole's Bill and by certain amendments of it. This measure he regarded as a reasonable mode of settling a difficult question, and more just than the total abolition or the entire commutation of church-rates.

Sir G. Grey observed, that the choice was not limited to the two Bills of Mr. Walpole and Sir J.

Trelawny; the question was, whether the House ought to adopt the scheme of the former as placed upon a satisfactory basis. He agreed that it would be an arbitrary act on the part of the House to deprive every rural parish throughout the kingdom where rates were willingly paid, of the power of raising a small sum for the repair of the parish church; but he stated various objections to the machinery of the Bill before the House (including the additional provisions suggested by Mr. Estcourt), which he considered did not rest upon a satisfactory basis. His principal objection was, that the Bill left untouched those parishes where the question had been settled by the practical abolition of church-rates; and he could not vote for the second reading.

Sir J. Pakington, rising with some warmth, said the speech of Sir G. Grey had forced upon his mind, the conviction that the spirit of party was still to be paramount on this question to the spirit of peace, and, because the gentlemen opposite to him had shrunk from dealing with it, they would not allow others to deal with it. Sir George Grey had, he said, shown why, according to the rules of the House, he ought to vote for the second reading, and had not assigned any reason why he should not do so. There were two principles in the Bill, to neither of which Sir George Grey objected; yet he declared he should vote against a second reading of it. In considering the real scope and intention of the Bill, Sir John remarked that all property was subject to the charge of church-rate, and that there was no injustice in enforce-

ing it; but although this was a legal and ancient charge, he agreed that it might be grating to the feelings of Dissenters to pay it, and he was willing to meet them in a spirit of peace and conciliation. This was the spirit in which the Bill had been framed. The present Government had done what their predecessors never did, made a fair offer; and it remained for the House and the country to decide whether this question should be settled in a friendly spirit, or continue a subject of prolonged agitation.

Sir R. Bethell observed that, after the speech of Sir J. Pakington, he had some difficulty in understanding what was his notion of peace and conciliation. He had brought charges against Sir G. Grey which were groundless and unjust, and had conveyed them in language anything but conciliatory. He disputed the doctrine of Sir J. Pakington as to the origin and nature of church-rates, which he (Sir R. Bethell) characterized as the progeny of a wicked system of intolerance which dictated one mode of faith for all. The common law even now treated all the occupiers in the parish as men of the same form of belief; this was the foundation of the liability to church-rate, and to this the Dissenters objected.

Mr. Drummond said it was with very great pain he differed from the proposal of Mr. Walpole: but palliatives would not do. This was a question of principle, or it was nothing. A rush was made by a large party in the country to pull down the Established Church, and he would not assist them by supporting this or any similar measure.

Mr. Ball gave his hearty support to the Bill as the only practical mode of settling this question and securing the fabric of the Established Church, while it relieved Dissenters from the obligation of contributing to that church.

Mr. Lowe said the present state of the law of church-rates was not only oppressive to Dissenters, but was objected to by many churchmen, and he insisted that the Bill did not remedy its evils. It was no compromise, and it would not cure the great evil, the *quasi* civil wars to which the present Bill gave rise.

Mr. Walpole called attention to the important fact that the House had arrived at the second reading of this Bill, when the only question to be determined was the principles involved in the measure, and not the mere machinery. The principles were two—first, the voluntary commutation, instead of the compulsory payment of church-rates; second, the exemption of those who objected conscientiously to paying them. No opponent of the Bill, he observed, had pointed out wherein these two principles were open to objection. He vindicated its provisions, and insisted, in opposition to Mr. Drummond, that it did not conflict with the principle of a Church Establishment.

Upon a division, the amendment was carried by 254 to 171. The Bill was consequently lost.

Another attempt to settle this much-vexed question was made by Sir A. H. Elton, one of the members for Bath, who, on the rejection of Mr. Walpole's Bill, propounded a scheme for the solution of the difficulty,

which underwent a brief discussion in the House, but led to no practical result. Sir A. Elton's plan was described in the following resolutions:—

“1. That this House, considering that church-rates are productive of frequent strife and litigation, and have ceased to be levied in an increasing number of parishes, deems it advisable that they should be wholly discontinued, except for payment of existing charges thereon, and that the maintenance of the fabric of the church should be confided to the zeal and liberality of the clergy and laity.

“2. That in order to afford every facility for the free exercise of that zeal and liberality, it is expedient that in every parish the incumbent and churchwardens should form a corporation, with power to take, hold, and manage all property given or appropriated for purposes relating to the parish church, and to administer the income thence arising.

“3. That the authority of the present vestry in every parish with reference to the parish church should be transferred to a new vestry, to be termed ‘The Church Vestry,’ to consist of the incumbent and churchwardens, and those owners and occupiers of property in the parish who give not less than a fixed yearly sum to the parish church funds, the present vestry retaining its authority in secular affairs.

“4. That the churchwardens should be chosen from the members of the church vestry, and their purely secular duties performed by the overseers.”

In proposing these resolutions to the House. Sir A. Elton stated reasons why, in his opinion, the

abolition of church-rates must form the main ingredient of any measure on the subject. Those who desired to see the settlement of this painful question, he said, should provide some reasonable machinery that would enable churchmen to bear the burthen that would be cast upon them, and thereby secure the passing of the measure in the other House.

Mr. Sotheron Estcourt suggested to Sir A. Elton that, in the existing circumstances of this question, having now stated his views, he would do better to withdraw his resolutions.

Mr. W. Cowper concurred in this recommendation, believing that no useful object would be gained by pressing the motion.

After some remarks from Mr. Newdegate, Sir A. Elton acceded to the suggestion of the Home Secretary, explaining that he had not intended by his resolutions to prevent Dissenters from attending the vestry, or contributing to the rates. His resolutions were simply intended as a basis upon which to act hereafter.

The motion was thereupon withdrawn.

On the 15th of March Sir John Trelawny moved the second reading of his Bill for the total abolition of the rate; whereupon

Mr. Griffith moved, as an amendment, a resolution, “That any amendment of the law relating to church-rates which should exempt persons contributing to the support of some other place of worship than the parish church from the payment of the rate, at the same time that the existing machinery for the support of the fabric of the Church of England should be continued in operation upon the members of her own

communion, is worthy of the consideration of this House." His speech in support of this amendment embraced a great variety of topics, some of them new to the debate upon the question.

Mr. Sotherton Estcourt recommended Mr. Griffith, as he had had a full opportunity of explaining his views, to withdraw his resolution, which could lead to no substantial result.

After some discussion, Mr. Griffith acceded to this course.

Mr. A. B. Hope then moved to defer the second reading of the Bill for six months. The cry against church-rates, he said, came from a divided and composite party: the demand for the total abolition of the rates he traced to a political organization, which employed it as a means to an end—the destruction of church property. He reviewed the objections to the existing system of raising the rates, and suggested remedies, including the exemption of Dissenters, protesting against all schemes which involved spoliation.

The amendment was seconded by Mr. Deedes, who wished, he said, on the one hand, to afford to Nonconformists the relief to which they considered themselves entitled, and, on the other, to secure to Churchmen the power to carry out what they regarded as a salutary mode of maintaining the fabric of the church.

Mr. Osborne regretted that the time for compromise upon this subject had gone by. It was no reason, however, for refusing to do justice because certain parties rejected all compromise, and had ulterior objects. He was prepared to debate the question as to the legality of the tax, which

was, he asserted, in its origin, voluntary. But was the existing state of the law, he asked, satisfactory? What was the use of maintaining it when, as he believed, there was no danger to the fabrics of churches? We had the example of Scotland before us, and the parishes in England where no church-rates were levied, yet where the churches were kept in perfect repair.

Mr. S. Wortley said he had always contended against a total abolition of church-rates, and been anxious for a compromise; but he thought that all attempts either at commutation or compromise were now hopeless. The decision upon Mr. Walpole's Bill was a declaration that this fester would yield to no remedy but absolute extinction. We had come to a state of things when the existing law could not be maintained without injury to the Church as well as the community. After much deliberation, he had arrived at the conclusion to vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Sidney Herbert said he would not discuss the history of church-rates, or whether they were legal or illegal. These rates had altered their character immensely within the last few years; since a majority in the parish could decide whether there should be a church-rate or not, the whole question had changed. The present state of things, in his opinion, would be preferable to that which would be brought about if Mr. Walpole's Bill had passed. He was not, therefore, in a hurry to alter the law. Not all who opposed church-rates were Dissenters; the rates were resisted from the common antipathy to a tax. The Bill proposed to re-

move an injustice to Dissenters, and its effect certainly would be to relieve Dissenters; but how would Churchmen stand? The real truth was, that the Church of England was parochial in the country and congregational in towns. The nearest approach to an equitable adjustment of this question was the proposal of Sir A. Elton, and he would urge that every place and parish should be allowed to determine for itself, which would put an end to all dissension. Unless some such change was introduced into the Bill, he must vote against the second reading.

After speeches from Mr. Packe and Lord John Manners against the second reading of the Bill, and Mr. Greenwood in favour of it, Sir J. Trelawny replied; and a division took place, when the second reading was carried by 242 to 168.

The Ministerial crisis which followed prevented any further proceeding with the Bill.

An important question, affecting the principles of religious liberty, was mooted on the 24th of February by Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald, who had been Attorney-General for Ireland under Lord Palmerston's Administration. It related to the oath taken by Roman Catholic members of Parliament under the provisions of the 10 Geo. IV. c. 7 (the Catholic Relief Act). The object of Mr. Fitzgerald was to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the omission of the words inserted in that oath, which were designed for the special security of the Established Church, and to the placing of Roman Catholics on the same footing with regard to the oath to be taken by them as

other members of Parliament. Having read and commented upon the terms of the oath prescribed by the statute, and having suggested the motives which, as he believed, had induced Sir Robert Peel in 1829 to introduce them into the oath, the honourable and learned gentleman contended that some of these restrictions were degrading and insulting, others wholly unnecessary and futile. With respect to that part of the oath which disclaimed any design to subvert the present Church Establishment, he adverted to the difficulty of putting a construction upon it, and insisted upon the exposition of the passage given by Sir Robert Peel, who declared that there was no intention to fetter Roman Catholics in the exercise of their privileges in that House. In the Bill he desired to introduce the terms of the oath to be substituted for the present oath would correspond with those of the oath proposed in 1854. In urging that the supposed securities contained in the present oath—which had been done away with in our colonial dependencies—were superfluous, he dwelt upon the tried loyalty of Roman Catholics in all stations, upon the unflinching gallantry of our Roman Catholic soldiers, and upon the testimony borne by Lord Eglintoun to the character of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland; and he claimed, on behalf of the Roman Catholic members of that House, the right to be placed upon terms of perfect equality with other members.

Mr. Fagan seconded the motion.

Mr. Adams regretted that a

motion should be brought forward calculated like this to disturb the harmony which now subsisted between the Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland. His ground of opposition to the motion was shortly this:—He believed that there had been a perfectly well understood compact and agreement upon which the settlement of 1829 was based. This proposal would interfere with that compact, and he believed it would be a breach of faith.

Mr. C. Fortescue, as an Irish Protestant, concurred in the motion. He denied that the proposition was the breach of any bargain, or a violation of faith. He maintained that the Roman Catholics had a right to come to Parliament to be relieved from an oath the terms of which were offensive. No one could believe that the imposition of this miserable and insulting oath really added to the security of the Protestant Government or the Protestant religion.

Mr. Whiteside said, in common with Mr. Adams, he regretted sincerely the introduction of a motion calculated to revive discussions which it would be the wisest course for Roman Catholics to surrender to oblivion. In reply to those who urged that this oath was no security, he showed that Mr. Plunkett, the great advocate of the Roman Catholics, relied upon the oath as the best argument for their admission into Parliament. The opinions of Sir R. Peel, he observed, were not to guide the House upon this question; it was not what Sir R. Peel thought, but what Parliament had done; yet Sir R. Peel had, like Mr.

VOL. CI.

Plunkett, offered the oath as one of the securities which the Roman Catholics were prepared to give, and which he believed would be binding upon conscientious men. The oath had been accepted by the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, who, after the Relief Act, had declared that the Parliament which had enacted the oath was entitled to the reverence and love of Roman Catholics.

Lord J. Russell said the view he took of this question was not the same as Mr. Fitzgerald's; but, as a member of the Legislature, he wished the House to consider whether it ought not from time to time to revise oaths, and see if any contained passages insulting to any party, and which might be removed without impairing any security. The House had acted last year upon that principle, and had relieved the Jews from the obligation of taking a part of the oath. Compact or no compact, the House was not fettered; if there had been a compact there was nothing to prevent the Legislature from altering the oath if it saw fit. This oath was not taken by all members; if it be necessary in order to guard the Established Church let every member take it. The House might depend upon it that if the Church establishment was subverted, it would not be by the votes of Roman Catholics, but by the votes of Protestants who held the voluntary principle, and that all endowments were unscriptural and wrong.

Mr. Newdegate, in replying to Lord J. Russell, reminded him of the incidents connected with the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and

[E]

warned him, as the spirit which prompted the attempt at which that measure was aimed was not extinct, against casting aside a safeguard of which Roman Catholics had, he said, no right to complain.

Mr. Maguire said he was ready to swear allegiance to the Crown, but why should he be obliged to swear against what was contrary to law and to truth? He denied that there had been any compact; but suppose there had been, the Legislature was not to be bound by what took place 30 years ago.

Lord Claude Hamilton complained that he had been misrepresented by Mr. Fitzgerald with reference to a transaction in 1853.

Mr. Walpole said, if the House were devising a new form of oath it was possible that a better form might be suggested; but the question was whether there was any good reason to alter a form imposed in 1829. Unless there was a strong reason for altering it, there would be an alarm created in the Protestant mind of the people of this country, and the inference would be that

something was wished to be done that could not now be done. For the sake of peace, and the settlement of a great question, he hoped the House would not think it expedient to go into Committee.

Mr. Vernon Smith supported the motion. The question, he said, had been re-opened last year, when the oath was altered to admit the Jews.

Mr. Spooner insisted that the oath was part and parcel of the bargain of 1829.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied; and upon a division the House decided to go into Committee upon the oath by a majority of 122 to 113. The same honourable gentleman afterwards moved for leave to bring in a Bill to substitute an oath for that now required to be taken by Roman Catholics. The House again divided on this motion as follows:—

Ayes	120
Noes	105

Majority , 15

No further steps were taken in the matter during this session.

CHAPTER III.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—*Expectations of the promised Ministerial Measure*—On the 28th of February the Chancellor of the Exchequer states the proposals of the Government with respect to the representation of the people—His speech—Remarks of Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, Mr. Baxter, Mr. H. Drummond, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Bentinck, and other Members—Leave is given to bring in the Bill. **EXPLANATIONS** by Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley of their reasons for seceding from the Ministry—Inclination of Public Opinion on the Ministerial Bill—The clause for disfranchising County Voters in Boroughs is much objected to—Various Notices of Amendments given by Members and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to this clause—The Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill commences on the 20th of March, and lasts seven nights—Lord John Russell moves an adverse Amendment—Summary of the principal speeches—The Bill is supported by Lord Stanley, Mr. Horsman, Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, Sir Hugh Cairns, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. J. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Roebuck, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Gladstone—The Amendment is advocated by Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cardwell, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Edwin James, Mr. Ellice, Sir James Graham, and other Members—Upon a Division the Amendment is carried by a Majority of 89—Consequences of this Division—The Earl of Derby in the House of Lords, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons, announce that they have advised Her Majesty to appeal to the People, and that Parliament will be dissolved—Expressions of Opinion in both Houses on this announcement—The Government abandon all Measures except those of pressing importance, Votes of Supply, and the Indian Loan Bill—Debate on the Third Reading of that Bill—Explanations of Lord Stanley, and remarks of Mr. Crawford, Sir Charles Wood, Mr. T. Baring, Colonel Sykes, and Sir H. Willoughby—The Bill is passed. **AFFAIRS OF ITALY AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH FOREIGN POWERS**—The Ministers meet the demand for information on this subject by giving Explanations in both Houses on the 18th of April—Speech of the Earl of Malmesbury on that occasion—Speeches of the Earl of Clarendon and Earl of Derby—The Chancellor of the Exchequer acquaints the House of Commons with the course of the Negotiations and the Policy of the Government with respect to Italy—Speeches of Lord Palmerston;

Mr. T. Duncombe, Mr. Gladstone, Lord John Russell, and other Members—Parliament is prorogued by Commission on the 19th of April—The Royal Speech—The Dissolution is notified in the Gazette on the 23rd, and the New Writs are issued.

THE great point on which public interest centred, involving the fate of the Ministry and the issue of the session, was the promised measure of Parliamentary Reform. It had been announced, as we have seen, in the Queen's Speech, and it was generally regarded as the event on which the continuance or downfall of Lord Derby's Administration hinged. Conjecture was busy on the subject; but the Ministerial counsels were well kept, and not until the moment of its promulgation in the House of Commons was any intimation of the intention of the Government suffered to transpire. At the commencement of the session there appeared to be some reluctance on the part of the Government to enter upon the subject, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that it was their intention to give precedence to their measures for the increase of the Navy, and other pressing questions. This apparent backwardness called forth some remonstrances and taunts from the Opposition; but, whether stimulated by these remarks, or in pursuance of their original design, the Government met the charge of delay in the most effectual manner by fixing an early date, viz., the 28th of February, for the first reading of their Bill. On that day, in a very crowded House, and amidst great expectations on both sides, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proceeded to state the details of the measure for the reform of

the representation which he and his colleagues were prepared to recommend.

Mr. Disraeli began by enlarging on the importance of the question—more important than that of peace or war—and the difficulties that beset it—difficulties mitigated by “the absence of passion and the advantage of experience.” The tribunal to which he appealed was as impartial as was compatible with a popular form of government. There was a general wish to settle the question, and the Government offered a solution not based upon any mean concession or temporary compromise, but consistent with the spirit and principles of the constitution. They were in a far more favourable position than those who in 1832 so ably dealt with the question, and introduced a measure equal to the emergency it controlled and directed. Without attributing to the legislation of 1832 every measure of public benefit that had since been passed, it might be said that it had added greatly to the energy and public spirit in which we had then become somewhat deficient. But the transactions of that time were eminently experimental, and hence it was not to be wondered at that some errors were committed. Still our progress since 1832 had not only been rapid, but, perhaps, precipitate; and there was no instance in history of such an increase of population and accumulation of capital as those which had taken place in England since 1832. Hence Parlia-

mentary Reform had become successively a public question, a Parliamentary question, and a Ministerial question. It was ten years since Lord John Russell declared that some alteration ought to be made in the settlement of 1832. Successive Ministers—Lord John Russell in 1852, and Lord Aberdeen in 1854—counselled Her Majesty to announce from the throne a measure of Parliamentary Reform. Another statesman, who might well be compared with the two distinguished men who preceded him, a statesman renowned not only for his ability, but his great experience, and who might be characterised as one who had no morbid sympathy with advanced opinions—that noble lord also counselled his sovereign to inform Parliament that their attention would be called to the laws which regulate the representation of the people. Nor was the House reluctant to deal with the question. What under these circumstances was Lord Derby's duty? It might have been practicable by evasion to stave off the solution of the question. But was it to be left in abeyance—as a means of reorganizing an Opposition, as a desperate resource of faction? He could not think that a course free from danger or honourable to any public man. Lord Derby's Cabinet were unanimous in thinking that the question should be dealt with in a sincere and earnest spirit. Nor was there anything in the antecedents or position of the Premier—whom Lord Grey had summoned to his Cabinet in 1832—to preclude him from dealing with the question. In 1854 the Conservatives declared

their willingness to consider any measure that might be introduced by Lord Aberdeen. Hence Mr. Disraeli could not understand the justness of the taunts so freely used against the present ministry undertaking the task which no Conservative ought to shrink from.

He then proceeded to describe what he regarded as the two distinct schools of Parliamentary Reformers:—The first class, he said, consisted of those who would adapt the settlement of 1832 to the England of 1859, and would act in the spirit and in accordance with the genius of the Constitution, and among this class he included Her Majesty's Ministers. The other class composed a new school of Reformers, who acted avowedly upon a different principle; their doctrine was that the chief, if not the sole, object of representation was to realize the opinions of the population numerically; their standard was population. But, although population was one element of this question, another was property. He admitted that the new school had not excluded the element of property; they acknowledged that population and property should go together in statistics, but in nothing else. That House ought to represent not only numbers and property, but all the interests of the country, and these interests were often antagonistic and competing. After dwelling at some length upon the injustice and the anomalies attending the adoption of the principle of population, he insisted that if population be the standard, boroughs must be disfranchised, and the Members

given to counties. The object of representation was to present a mirror of the mind of the country, its agriculture, its manufacturing industry, its commerce, its professional ability. Hitherto this object had been effected; and if this system were subverted, Parliament was bound to substitute a machinery equally effective. But the new school would confine the constituency to a very limited class. If the House of Commons were re-formed and re-constructed according to the principle of population, it would find itself in the ignominious position from which it had been emancipated more than two centuries ago. The change which it would be his duty to recommend would not, therefore, rest upon the principle of population, nor upon that of property joined with population.

Mr. Disraeli then passed on to the consideration of the franchise, both in counties and in boroughs. It was proposed, he said, not to alter the limits of the franchise, but to introduce into boroughs a new kind of franchise, founded upon personal property, and to give a vote to persons having property to the amount of 10*l.* a year in the Funds, Bank Stock, and East India Stock; a person having 60*l.* in a savings-bank would, under the Bill, be an elector for the borough in which he resided, as well as the recipients of pensions in the naval, military, and civil services amounting to 20*l.* a year. Dwellers in a portion of a house whose aggregate rent was 20*l.* a year would likewise have a vote. The suffrage would also be conferred upon graduates of the Universities, ministers of religion, mem-

bers of the legal profession, and of the medical body, and certain schoolmasters. In considering the county franchise, he reviewed the controversy respecting the Chandos clause in the Act of 1832. To terminate the heart-burnings arising from it, and to restore the county constituency to its natural state, and bring about a general content and sympathy between the different portions of the constituent body, the Government proposed to recognize the principle of identity of suffrage between the counties and the towns. They proposed that Boundary Commissioners should visit the boroughs in England, re-arrange them, and adapt them to the altered circumstances of the times; their appointment would be delegated to the Enclosure Commissioners. The effect of giving to counties a 10*l.* franchise would be, according to the estimate of the Government, to add to the county constituency 200,000. Having laid before the House the character of the proposed electoral body, he next proceeded to state how it was proposed they should be registered, and how they were to vote. Overseers of parishes would be required to furnish a list of owners as well as occupiers, which would be a self-acting register. It was proposed that the number of polling-places should be greatly increased, that every parish having 200 electors should be a polling-place; that every voter should vote in the place where he resided, and that those who liked it might vote by polling-papers instead of going to the hustings, precautions being provided against fraud and personation. A complete represen-

tation, he proceeded to observe, did not depend upon the electoral body; it also depended upon whether the different interests of the country were adequately represented. Discarding the principle of population, and accepting as a truth that the function of that House was to represent, not the voice of a numerical majority or the influence of a predominant property, but the various interests of the country, the Government had felt it to be their duty to see whether there were interests not represented, and whether the general representation of the country could be matured and completed; and they proposed to add four members to the West Riding of Yorkshire, two to South Lancashire, and two to Middlesex; and that the following towns should be represented:—Hartlepool, Birkenhead, West Bromwich, and Wednesbury, Burnley and Staleybridge, Croydon, and Gravesend. Assuming that, in the opinion of the House, its numbers ought not to be increased, means must be found for the representations of these interests, and those means had been found before in similar circumstances, and in the same constitutional spirit. He promised that a schedule of places now sending two members to Parliament which it was intended should hereafter return only one each should be laid before the House this day; but the cry of "Name, name," being loudly raised, Mr. Disraeli, after a little well-feigned reluctance, proceeded to mention the names. They were Honiton, Thetford, Totness, Harwich, Evesham, Wells, Richmond, Marlborough, Leominster, Lymington, Ludlow, Andover, Knaresbo-

rough, Tewkesbury, and Maldon. With a few words in conclusion, in which he described the measure as "wise, prudent, adequate to the occasion, Conservative, and framed by men who reverence the past, are proud of the present, and confident of the future," Mr. Disraeli resumed his seat amidst considerable cheering.

Mr. Baxter opposed the motion for bringing in the Bill. He considered the scheme unfair and unjust to the people of Scotland, and not calculated to meet the fair claims of the country; and he moved a resolution as an amendment—"That it is expedient to consider the laws relating to the representation of the people in England, Scotland, and Ireland not separately, but in one measure."

Sir John Ogilvy seconded the amendment; but it found no favour with the House, and was subsequently withdrawn.

A number of members briefly expressed their opinions.

Mr. John Locke said that Mr. Disraeli had dealt with the question as if it effected the counties only. x

Mr. W. J. Fox objected that the Bill did nothing for the working classes. x

Lord John Russell said, that there were two points in Mr. Disraeli's statement which had filled him with very great apprehension. The first was what he understood him to say regarding freeholders in towns amounting to 90,000 or 100,000, that they were no longer to vote for the county. So far from this title to vote being an evil requiring a remedy, it was a very great advantage. The other point was a serious omission—namely, that

little or nothing was said for the working classes. Unless more satisfaction was meant to be given to the country, it would be better not to change the representation at all.

Mr. Roebuck observed that a change of the representation was only justifiable when it led to a better state of things. His objection to the Bill was that it would lead to a worse state. It would not give one iota of power to the working classes; it was a measure of disfranchisement, not of enfranchisement, and it would be opposed in every stage.

Mr. Bright said a Government representing a party which had always opposed the extension of political power to the people ought not to have undertaken to settle this question. He took exception to a great many points in the Bill; but chiefly to the total exclusion of the working classes from power. The new franchises were, he said, absurd; they seemed intended merely to make it appear that something was given. He insisted upon the dissatisfaction that would be created by the withdrawal of their county vote from freeholders in towns. It would have been better, he thought, if Mr. Disraeli had adhered to the ancient maxims of his party, or had adopted a measure of his opponents, than had introduced a Bill which must create anger and disgust throughout the country, which would disturb everything and settle nothing.

Mr. Drummond professed not to understand the Bill. He understood, he said, the Bill of 1832, which was an act of vengeance on the part of the Whigs against those who had kept them

out of power. He understood Mr. Bright's measure, and knew how to meet him; but he did not know how to meet this Bill.

Lord Palmerston considered that it would be better to wait and see the Bill, before its details, which had been imperfectly explained, were discussed.

Mr. Bentinck, not being prepared to give an opinion upon the Bill, adverted to the speeches made on several occasions by Mr. Bright; the only conclusion he could draw from them was that his views were those of a leveller and a communist.

Mr. Disraeli replied to several questions. He said the Government intended to reserve the forfeited seats for Sudbury and St. Alban's. They proposed that an elector who might have a double qualification in a borough, should have only one vote. He retorted upon Lord J. Russell, that in his own Reform Bill, he proposed to disfranchise the whole body of freemen. He insisted that the Saving Banks deposit and 40s. freehold clauses were two avenues for the working classes to constituent power, and he asserted his claim to understand the wants and wishes of the labouring classes as well as Mr. Bright. Leave was then given to bring in the Bill.

The next feature in the discussion was an explanation on the part of two Members of the Cabinet, Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley, of the reasons which had induced them to secede from the Ministry. On the evening after the introduction of the Reform Bill, Mr. Walpole rose from the seat which he had taken behind the Ministerial Bench, and requested the attention of the House

to a statement of the transaction which had caused him to adopt a resolution, the motives for which had been much misunderstood. He said that when a year ago Lord Derby asked him to join his Government, he wished on public and private grounds to decline. Mr. Walpole doubted whether he could agree with his colleagues on the Reform Bill they were to propose; but Lord Derby pressed him in the kindest manner, remarking that the Reform Bill was a subject for consideration, and the Government was not pledged to any part. To this Mr. Walpole replied, that he would accept office, if there were nothing dishonourable in retiring from office should he not agree with his colleagues on the Reform question. It was upon these terms he joined the Government. Now, he had no difficulty in conjecturing what the principle of the Bill would be, since Lord Derby in 1854 had explicitly recognized the distinction between the two great divisions of constituencies; those which represent property, and those which represent occupation and residence. "I do trust," said Lord Derby in 1854, "that the Government in the measure they are about to introduce, will not attempt to break down this old, well-grounded, and most important distinction." Those were the words of his noble friend in 1854; and he recollected those words when he joined the Government. Mr. Walpole went on to state that as soon as he learned the nature of the measure his colleagues were about to propose, he felt that he had no alternative but to resign his office into the

hands of Lord Derby. On the 27th January he addressed a letter to that noble lord, which he read to the House. It was in these terms:—

"27th January, 1859.

"My dear lord,—I regret to say that I am about to take the most painful step which I have ever had to take in the whole of my life. I am going to request you to place my resignation in Her Majesty's hands, because, I find it is utterly impossible for me to sanction or countenance the course of policy which the Government have now determined to adopt on the important subject of Parliamentary reform. When you were so good as to ask me to join your present Administration, I told you I thought that I had better decline. I then foresaw that there were one or two questions with reference to which I might not be able to agree with my colleagues. On being assured, however, that, if that should happen, there would be nothing dishonourable to you or to them in asking leave to retire, I consented again to bear my part in the arduous task which the Queen was pleased to invite you to undertake. Parliamentary reform was one of those questions; and it is now quite clear that I cannot hope to come to an agreement with the majority of the Cabinet. The reduction of the county occupation franchise to a level with that which exists in boroughs, is utterly contrary to every principle which the Conservatives as a party have always maintained. It is a complete destruction of the main distinction which has hitherto been recognized and wisely esta-

blished between the borough and the county constituencies. It is to my mind a most dangerous innovation, by giving to temporary and fluctuating occupations a preponderating influence over property and intelligence, while it throws large masses into the constituencies, who are almost exempt from direct taxation, and therefore interested in forcing their representatives to fix that taxation permanently on others. I will not dwell upon other points, for this is enough. But I cannot help saying that the measure which the Cabinet are prepared to recommend is one which we should all of us have stoutly opposed, if either Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell had ventured to bring it forward. (*Laughter and Opposition cheers.*) Under all these circumstances, I have no alternative but to repeat the request with which I commenced; and I shall, therefore, consider myself as only holding the seals of office until you can conveniently fill up my place."

On receiving this letter, Lord Derby had requested him, in consideration of the great difficulties with which the Government was surrounded, to delay the announcement of his resignation until after the meeting of Parliament, and he had consented to retain his office on condition that he should be allowed to retire from it, before the Reform Bill should be brought in. In consequence of this engagement he had for the last three weeks continued to occupy his post on the Ministerial bench, doing, as he hoped, his duty to the House, his colleagues and the country. Mr. Walpole lastly adverted to a

report that had been in circulation, that he had desired to reduce the borough franchise to 6*l*. "How that should be known, I cannot tell; but I do know that any information which I have given upon that subject was of the most private and confidential character. I also know that I never proposed such a measure as that to the Cabinet, but, on the contrary, told my colleagues—and they well know it—that I was prepared, if they thought they could adopt it, to stand by the 10*l*. value, which had been settled by the Reform Act of 1832. I shall not disguise from the House, now that the circumstance has been published to the world, that I think it is desirable you should obtain some resting-places to which the franchise should be limited, and that those resting-places should be adopted as a permanent settlement of the question. I believe, for reasons to which I shall advert on the second reading of the Bill, that a reduction to a 20*l*. occupancy in counties would have been such a resting-place, and that a reduction in boroughs to a 6*l*. rating, which is equal to an 8*l*. value, would also have been such a resting-place, because, that is the point at which a landlord ceases to be able to compound for his tenant's rates." Mr. Walpole proceeded to complain with some warmth of the publication of private opinions expressed in the Cabinet as the reasons of his resignation when in truth they were not so. He expressed his approval of the general policy of the Government, and offered to them, as an independent Member, his cordial support.

Mr. Henley said, that he would

have been content to let his case stand upon the explanation of Mr. Walpole, but his own position differed somewhat from that of his friend. He had accepted office on the sole condition that the Government should deal with the Reform question, but he had taken as his guide the principle laid down by Lord Derby in 1854:—"I believe," said the hon. gentleman, "that identity of suffrage, which is the principle of the Government Bill, is fatal to the constitution of this country. (*Cries of "No, no!" and cheers.*) I care not whether it is 10*l.*, or 15*l.*, or 5*l.*; I care not at what sum you fix it, but I hold that, if you take a paint brush to draw a line across the country, and say that all the people upon one side are to have the franchise, and all the people upon the other are not to have it, although you may have no trouble for a few years, yet as sure as the sun is in heaven, you will have all the people upon the outside of the line, at some time or other, making a very ugly rush to break over it. Depend upon it, that when they do break over it in that way, you will not find it easy to maintain the constitution of England. You have no precedent for the present proposal in your past history. You could not get identity of suffrage without a large measure of disfranchisement. To obtain it, you are obliged to disfranchise all that large number of persons who have a freehold franchise within boroughs, who, as far as I know, value that franchise, who wish to retain it, and who have not abused it. I, for one, could never consent to secure identity of franchise upon such condi-

tions. Ever since the Act of 1832 the working people have had a less and less share in the representation. Before 1832 they had considerable power through the scot and lot voters, and free-men. To draw a hard line and leave the working people behind it, is to lay the foundation of revolution. It is for that reason that I cannot agree to identity of franchise. If there be an identity of franchise, the whole electoral power would then be placed in one class, and whether it were a 10*l.*, 15*l.*, or 5*l.* class, it would, in my judgment, be equally dangerous. Our safety—the permanence of this constitution, in my judgment, has depended on the great variety of the constituency. You never have all classes at one time for one thing. If anything is proposed it gets well ventilated and well considered, and then the truth is found out and the country accepts it. I believe that under an identity of franchise you would lose that great and invaluable safeguard." Mr. Henley proceeded to state that as early as the end of December he wished to retire; but he was pressed, like Mr. Walpole, to remain; but at the end of January he had placed his resignation in the hands of the Minister. As to the franchise, he thought that in boroughs ought to be lower. It had been said that he did not mind the boroughs so long as he could take care of the counties. That was one way of putting the case; but when he looked at the improvements among the working classes, he did not see that it was any degradation to the boroughs to say that that portion of his fellow-countrymen ought to have

a voice in elections. The right hon. gentleman resumed his seat amidst considerable cheering.

In the interval which elapsed before the second reading of the Bill, its provisions underwent a good deal of discussion and criticism. The objection most strongly urged by Liberal politicians was pointed against the clause by which it was proposed to take away from freeholders in boroughs the franchise by which they are now qualified to vote for counties. This was regarded by many as an indirect method of neutralizing the concession of the county franchise to the 10*l.* freeholders, and to this part of the Bill a vigorous opposition was threatened. Nor was it only among the Liberal party that this objection was entertained. Conservative politicians also took exception to the proposed disfranchisement. A few days after the Bill was introduced, Lord J. Russell gave notice that he should move the following Resolution:—"That this House is of opinion that it is neither just nor politic to interfere in the manner proposed by this Bill with the freehold franchise as hitherto exercised in counties in England and Wales; and that no readjustment of the franchise will satisfy this House or the country which does not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage in cities and boroughs than is contemplated in the present measure."

Mr. Arthur Mills at the same time gave notice that in Committee he would, in clause 1, move words saving the rights of existing county freeholders within the limits of boroughs, and negating so much of the clause as

would permit non-resident freeholders to vote for boroughs.

These demonstrations of opinion were not unheeded by the Government.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the same occasion, stated that the subject in question was under the consideration of the Cabinet—that it was one of the principles of the measure that no place or person should be disfranchised, and that he hoped they would find means by some clauses about to be proposed of reconciling the main principle of the measure with the views of the House in regard to the point referred to.

Accordingly, a few days afterwards, Mr. Disraeli gave notice of the following clause, reserving the option to existing freeholders in boroughs to vote for the county if they should prefer to do so. "Provided always, That any person who at the passing of this Act shall be entitled to be registered as a voter for any county in respect of his ownership of any freehold, copyhold, or leasehold interest in property situate within the limits of any borough, shall, in case he shall think proper to claim the same, according to the provisions hereinafter contained, have the option to be registered in respect of such property for the county within which such borough is situate; but, in order to be so registered, such claim must be sent in to the overseers of the parish in which such property shall be situate not later than the twenty-fourth day of July in the year next but one following the passing of this Act; and after such claim shall have been once made and ad-

mitted for such county, the claimant shall be incapacitated from ever claiming to vote for such borough in respect of the same, or in respect of his ownership of any other freehold, copyhold, or leasehold property in such borough, so long as he shall continue to hold the qualification in respect of which he shall have so claimed to vote for the county as aforesaid."

On the 20th of March the great debate on the second reading of the Bill began, and lasted through seven nights. It was sustained throughout with much spirit, and many of the speeches were characterized by a degree of ability and eloquence which well sustained the reputation of the House of Commons. From the multitude of speeches, our space compels us to make a very limited selection. We can only attempt to notice those which attracted peculiar notice, either from the position of the speakers, or the arguments which they contained. Before the debate commenced, a great number of petitions were presented; but it was remarkable that while a great shoal was poured in against the Bill, only three appeared in its favour. Some of the petitions demanded manhood suffrage, the ballot, and other strong measures.

Mr. Disraeli having moved that "the Bill be now read a second time," without any speech,

Lord John Russell rose at once and moved the amendment before announced by him. He said very little by way of preface. Although it was a question whether, upon taking office, the Ministers should have promised to bring in a Bill, there was no doubt it was their duty to

fulfil their pledge. Lord John was encouraged in the course he was about to take by the objections made to the Bill by Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley. "The principle of the Bill," he proceeded to say, "is in the first clause [which he read to the House]; that principle is that the suffrage throughout the country in counties and boroughs shall be uniform, or as Mr. Disraeli expresses it identical. Now, this will completely change the constitution of the country, destroy rights enjoyed for an immense length of time—some from the Conquest—deprive men of their county votes who have not shown themselves unworthy of the trust, force them to vote in boroughs, and take away from the county constituencies one of the liberal elements. That will be a public injury. Next, the proposal will enable persons of landed property to flood small boroughs with faggot votes. Say that 40s. freeholds may be formed in boroughs, and what remains of the independence they acquired from the 10*l.* franchise? They become what they were before 1832—nomination boroughs. The small boroughs are not now all so. Liskeard is not. Thus the first proposition in the Bill repeals the Reform Act of 1832 by destroying the independence of the small boroughs. It is not an extension of the suffrage: it is an act of violence. It is said that Parliament will interfere to prevent nomination. That is true, but only as a step to further change. What change? Clearly one to electoral districts. The great impediment—the difference between counties and boroughs—will be taken away; the small

boroughs will be called nomination and corrupt, and it will be said—divide a county into electoral districts. If that is the object of the Government let us arrive at it at once, and not by a process of nomination, corruption, and agitation. Five years ago Lord Derby said the distinction was ‘one of the main balances of the constitution.’ Now it is Lord Derby who sanctions the removal of the distinction, and paves the way for electoral districts.”

“But while the Bill of the Government destroys what is ancient, it does not provide for what is new. Since the Reform Act, which gave the franchise to 10*l*. occupiers in boroughs, the working classes have made great progress in knowledge and capacity. Now the basis on which the representation should rest is fitness for the functions in the constituency. Can you say that there are not persons below the class of 10*l*. householders thoroughly fit for the suffrage? There are thousands of persons fit to exercise the franchise who are excluded. Two questions—Roman Catholic Emancipation and Corn Law Repeal—were refused to reason and calm petitions, and granted to noise, clamour, and agitation. It was to avoid a similar result, and not to gain popularity, that in 1851 the then Government proposed an extension of the franchise. In 1851 I proposed a certain franchise; in 1854 I proposed a modification of that franchise. I will not say now what that franchise ought to be at the present day. I hold that it is for the Government of the day to propose the franchise they may think right.

When I sat on the bench on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer now sits, I did not hesitate to propose what I thought right, and I was ready to discuss the question in this House. The question is are Ministers right in refusing any reduction in towns?” Lord John Russell declared himself in favour of a franchise based on “annual value” as opposed to “rating.” He also defended the course he now took in moving the amendment. The Conservatives who voted with Mr. Gibson last year on the Conspiracy Bill could hardly object to his amendment as irregular, for then they voted for an amendment which had no reference to a Bill of which they highly approved. Lord John’s reason for supporting Mr. Gibson was that he should thereby get rid of the Bill. “What reason the right honourable gentlemen opposite had for voting for that resolution, I don’t know, but at all events their conduct was not actuated by dislike of the Bill. Now, I say at once with regard to the Bill before the House, that I consider it to be a measure of a most noxious, injurious, and dangerous character.” (*Much cheering.*) He did not ask the House to reject the Bill on the second reading, because it would be said out of doors that a Bill to lower the franchise to 10*l*. in counties had been rejected. That was *not* the principle of the Bill—the principle was the identity of the suffrage. If they agreed to the second reading, the Government might well object to the omission of the principle in Committee. Lord John censured the plan of throwing the representation into hotch-pot, of inviting every one to bring forward

clauses in Committee as a proposal unworthy of a Government, degrading to the House, and not conducive to the public interest. It would be useless to go into Committee on the Bill. He was not to be deterred by the threat of an appeal to the country; and he wondered who would be the dupe of the assertion that the presence of Lord Malmesbury in the Foreign Office was a security for peace! It was said he had some party object in view. "But, sir, it is my duty not to attend to such charges, but to pursue the course which I think best adapted for the welfare of the country. It cannot be denied that for many years I have taken a deep interest in this question. Very long ago—so long ago, I am sorry to say, as the year 1819—I was occupied in this House in a laborious and irksome investigation into the bribery and corruption which prevailed in the borough of Gram-pound, with the view of disfranchising that borough and of conferring members on Leeds, which at that time had no representation, and I ventured even to propose that the 10*l*. householders of Leeds should be entitled to votes, a proposition which, as my honourable friend the member for Birmingham reminds me, excited great alarm at that time, as much alarm is now created by the proposal to give the franchise to householders below 10*l*. From that time to the present I have constantly taken the deepest interest in this question, and have promoted all measures which I thought tended to the free, fair, and pure representation of the people in Parliament. I am bound to take that course—I may be allowed, I may be privileged to

do so by my deep convictions on the subject. I have the satisfaction of knowing that the Act, in the passing of which I took part in 1831 and 1832 has been productive, not of those calamitous consequences which were predicted by our opponents, but of great benefits—benefits obtained not through bloodshed, not through civil war, but by peaceable and tranquil discussion, and by the legitimate influence of public opinion. Since that time slavery has been abolished; we have had the question of tithes, which was a vexatious question between the clergy and their parishioners, amicably arranged; we have had free municipal corporations established; there has been a great reduction in the duties on Customs and in those Excise duties which pressed heavily on the masses; Protection has been given up, and Free Trade sanctioned by Parliament. These and many other benefits have flowed from the reformed Parliament, which we were told would be so fruitful in calamity and disaster, and which was to take the crown off the King's head and shake the balance of the State. Sir, entertaining these convictions, seeing what has been done, I cannot view without alarm the proposition which is now before the House. I have endeavoured to call the attention of the House to two of the main demerits of this Bill. If it should continue on the table of the House, I think the measure ought to be discussed in every shape until at length, if not immediately, it is totally rejected. I shall take this course, careless of any imputations which may be cast upon me. With regard to

this great question of reform, I may say that I defended it when I was young, and I will not desert it now that I am old." (*Loud cheers.*)

Lord Stanley reminded Lord John Russell that he had driven a Government from office in 1835 upon a resolution which, after it had served that purpose, was suffered to fall into abeyance; and he cautioned the House against rejecting a moderate measure, which was proposed when there was no discontent in the country. Lord John had asked what right the present Ministers had to bring in a Reform Bill. The answer was, that if it were a political necessity no Administration ought to shrink from proposing it. The mode in which the Bill was met was unjust and unfair—it was equivalent to a vote of censure. The question was not whether the Bill should pass, but whether political power should go into other hands. That was the challenge which he, on the part of the Government, was ready to accept. It was said that if the resolution were carried, the Bill might still go to a second reading, but those who sat with him must be allowed to be the best judges of what was due to their honour and self-respect. The state of things was not analogous to that on the India Bill, which ought not to be drawn into a precedent. "I say, then, I am expressing the feelings of my colleagues and of those who support this measure, when I declare that the adoption of the resolution proposed by the noble lord must necessarily be fatal to the Bill." (*Loud cheers.*)

Lord Stanley then entered into a series of elaborate argu-

ments on the merits of the Bill. He contended that the Bill did not exclude the working classes, but provided for their discriminating admission, in the property qualification, and the lodger and savings' bank franchises. He quoted Mr. John Stuart Mill and Mr. Holyoake, who represent persons of extreme political opinions, to show that the working classes should not be indiscriminately admitted to the franchise. The principle should be admission by selection, and not admission in the mass; and for that the Bill provided. As to the small boroughs—their existence could not be defended upon principle—but if they had been disfranchised the Bill could not have been carried. Besides, there was a great difficulty in the re-distribution of seats. Therefore Ministers only dealt with the subject so far as the exigency demanded. Next, Lord Stanley defended the restoration of out-voters, by showing that the new feature in social life, residence at a distance from places of business, was recognized by restoring out-voters; that residence ought not to be demanded for boroughs any more than for counties; and that the making the payment of a voter's expenses illegal, rendered the change unobjectionable. The defence for identity of suffrage was, that without identity of suffrage we should always have dissatisfied classes. No measure that did not assimilate county and borough franchise would stop agitation for further extension. Besides the Chandos clause had broken down the distinction between ownership and occupancy, a distinction always partially carried out. Nor

out. Nor could they draw a line between town and country. Where does London end and Middlesex begin? It should also be remarked that, under the system of uniform suffrage, if a borough was disfranchised, the ten-pound occupiers would become voters for the county. They were not disfranchised; they were transferred. In like manner, Lord Stanley found many reasons for the clause affecting the interests of voters whose freeholds are in boroughs; contending that they were not disfranchised, but transferred from a large constituency, where they counted for little, to a smaller, where their votes told upon the election. Finally, he said, the choice at present lay between a comparatively small Bill and no Bill whatever.

Mr. Horsman took up a separate and distinct position in the debate. He said that Lord John Russell had made an extremely powerful speech against the second reading, but neither he nor any one had shown that the Bill could not be altered in Committee. The resolution was so framed as to provoke, if not justify, the accusation that it was a party-move. But Mr. Horsman and many Liberals had promised to give a fair consideration to the Bill, and he would not join any party-motion against it. The Liberal party it was who excited popular expectation. They had failed themselves. The time was favourable for a settlement, and it could only be accomplished by the honest co-operation of both sides of the House, and a scrupulous abstinence from all party-moves. The Liberals had an immense

VOL. CI.

numerical majority. They could mould the Bill as they pleased. If they did not avail themselves of their advantage, they would postpone legislation to a time when the passions of the million would usurp the functions of statesmen. The amendment meant a rejection of the Bill by a junction of all the Liberal leaders, Lord J. Russell, Mr. Bright, and Lord Palmerston. Their unanimity was not founded on an identity of sentiment. A Minister ought not to propose a Bill he could not carry. For this reason the Bill of 1854 was a mistake, and also because it did not deal with the ballot. He contended that the present Bill was capable of being altered in Committee into a better Bill than they had had since 1832. The most manly and sensible course would be, either to oppose the second reading, or to amend the Bill in Committee. Mr. Horsman proceeded to consider the effect which the present course of action would have on the position of the Liberal party. He traced the decline of the great Whig party to the vote which they gave in 1846 in order to turn Sir R. Peel out of office. Their present dissensions and weakness were the moral retribution of that proceeding. In what condition, he asked, had the party been ever since? In what condition, as a party, were they now? Could they justly be dignified with the title of a party? For the last twelve months they had been less a party than a mob—(laughter)—without leaders, without union or combination, without a common policy, principle, or purpose. Why, they had exhibited the most piteous spectacle—a spec-

[F]

tacle of the utter disorganization and the low estate to which a great party might sink, never to rise again until it recognized and dealt with the real cause of its calamities. Look at the resolution before the House. Wise heads, secret influences, had been at work upon it. It had come forth in the name of the noble lord, who was the putative parent; but whose image and superscription did it bear? Not the noble lord's, for it was a satire upon the manliness and directness with which he had grappled with the Bill on its first appearance. It did not reflect the wishes of the noble lord the Member for Tiverton, because they were well assured that his sympathies and sagacity would lead him to favour the second reading of this measure. It rather indicated that another victory had been achieved by that lower substitute for statesmanship which had too often meddled and manœuvred in the Cabinets, both of the noble lord the Member for Tiverton and the noble lord the Member for London, discrediting their Governments, and involving them and their followers in one common ruin.

Mr. Horsman proceeded to argue that if the Ministry had to go out upon Reform, the Opposition must re-construct the Government on that question; and further to express great doubts whether they could carry a measure; and his conviction that if the then Opposition stayed away, the new Reform Ministry would be beaten by five to one on the ballot. If this opportunity were rejected, he foresaw a course of agitation for

Reform culminating in a period when even Mr. Bright would be looked upon as a preserver.

Throughout his speech Mr. Horsman was greeted with loud cheers from the Ministerial side.

The Secretary for the Colonies (Sir E. Bulwer Lytton) made a very eloquent and animated speech—a "splendid declamation" as it was afterwards styled by Mr. Herbert. He said the question was, would the House accept the moderate measure offered by the Conservatives with large concessions, or would they wait for that other measure of which there was not a glimpse in the mere party amendment offered by Lord John Russell, and with regard to which they must calculate the odds whether it would satisfy the Radicals, as well as those who had spent 26 years in decoying Radical votes and abjuring Radical principles. A Conservative Government could give the same kind of Reform as Liberals and Whigs. They made concessions, and expected concessions. If their measure was not accepted, then the question of Reform would pass out of the hands of Lord Derby. But into whose hands would it pass? Noble lords and honourable gentlemen who were at this moment so carefully bridging the gangway with a rope of sand, might, by their experience, patch up the quarrels of years for the division of a night. But grant that they triumphed. Would not the quarrels of years show themselves in Downing Street? Could the Government that was to be formed last, unless Lord Palmerston and Mr. Bright, Lord John Russell and Mr. Roebuck should sit on the same bench? When the Govern-

ment took up the question, public opinion was listless, apathetic. Was it greatly changed now? Look at the state of Europe. Was this the precise moment, when, although we had peace to-day, we might have war to-morrow, to transfer political power from the middle classes to a wider area not up to the mark of education required to make the majesty of the intellect of England confront with effect foreign powers? The Bill of the Government was emphatically a Bill for the middle class. The cause was theirs down to the verge at which the influence of that class would melt away amidst the necessities of manual labour, and the turbulence of concentrated numbers.

"If they of the middle class," he continued, "like to abandon that cause, they abdicate their own power, and with it all which has hitherto made the resources of England unshaken amidst the vicissitudes of commerce, and the calamities of war. If they honestly think the time has come when it is safe to accept the counter principle which you advance—viz., that political power should begin to descend to the working class—not knowing where that principle, once adopted, can stop till it reaches manhood suffrage, then I say with the middle class the responsibility must rest. Meanwhile, you in this House will determine whether it is your duty thus abruptly to sign away the influence of that class of which you are still the representatives and trustees—whether you really secure the title-deeds of their commerce, and take solid guarantees for the safety of their old

English freedom, by accepting an amendment which commits you to a pledge to the working class—a pledge which you can never redeem to their satisfaction until you have placed capital and knowledge at the command of impatient poverty and uninstructed numbers."

Sir Edward Lytton enforced his main argument by working out its details. He showed that in refusing the compromise offered, the opponents of the Government would plunge the country, from end to end, into the midst of a violent party-battle—a calamity which Lord John Russell's amendment did not counterbalance, but which would be prevented by agreeing to the second reading. He contended that all the objections raised were proper subjects for debate in Committee.

Mr. Sidney Herbert supported the amendment. He disavowed being actuated by party-feeling. He thought the Reform question ought to be settled. He described the object of the House to be, "to arrive at a franchise moderately extended for boroughs and largely extended for counties." He disputed the validity of the uniformity of suffrage as a security against indefinite extension of the franchise, and he justified the retention of the small boroughs. He considered the question, "Who was to be Prime Minister in 1859?" of infinitely less importance than the effect which any measures they might adopt would have on the Constitution of the country. It was because he thought that the proposal now made by the Government would not tend to the improvement of that Constitu-

[F 2]

tion, that he supported the resolution before the House.

The Solicitor-General, Sir Hugh Cairns, made one of the ablest speeches in defence of the Ministerial measure. He regarded the amendment as designed to embarrass and confuse the House. He proceeded to submit the resolution to a close examination, in order to show, in answer to Lord J. Russell, that it is just to make freeholders who have property in boroughs vote for boroughs. Boroughs, he said, return members separate from counties, because they have a separate interest. Why should freehold property in a borough be dealt with on a principle different from that applied to other property? Would it be more unnatural to allow the holder of property outside a borough to vote for borough Members, than to allow a holder of property inside to vote for a Member outside a borough? A man may have many franchises, but only one vote, if he lives in a county; but if he lives in a borough he may vote in the borough as an occupier, and in the county as a freeholder. Is that fair and equitable? Moreover, since 1832, freeholds in boroughs above 10*l.* in value do not confer a vote for the county. Why, in 1854, Lord John proposed to disfranchise 45,000 freemen by a stroke of the pen. He made no apology; he did not, as this Bill will do, preserve existing rights; he swept them away. And yet he asked the House to vote for his amendment because freeholders would be deprived of their double votes! Sir Hugh denied that the Bill would facilitate the manufacture of votes; and insisted that the

Bill provided against it. He denied that the Government had said the House must take the Bill as it stands. What they had said was that they would not, on going into Committee, take instruction from a majority of the House as a pledge of the terms on which the second reading is to be passed. Any Government that tolerated such a proceeding would be unworthy to sit for one minute on those benches.

Sir Hugh said he could not stop short without inquiring "what is the practical object of the noble lord. What are his views? Does he retain his opinions on the ballot—a measure his constituents demand. We were informed last night that the hon. Member for Walsall (Mr. Forster) told his constituents distinctly that the noble lord and the hon. Member for Birmingham were, to use a popular phrase, 'in the same boat, and perfectly agreed upon every subject.' These are the honourable gentleman's words—'If you will wait till next week, you will find that there is a perfect agreement between Lord John Russell and John Bright.' If Mr. Bright and Lord John Russell are to row in the same boat, does their compact include the ballot?—without which the extension of the suffrage, it is said, would be a curse. Does it include a re-distribution of seats?—without which, it is said, the extension of the suffrage will be a sham and a farce. What seats will you take away? Tell us boldly. The House of Commons has a right to know. What part had Lord John selected from the extensive bill of fare presented by Mr. Bright? Some years ago, in a passage of arms between

them, Lord John found fault with Mr. Bright and his friends for being 'so narrow minded'—they have intellect and understanding bound up in so narrow a round, said the noble lord, that it is impossible to get them to understand the principles of the Constitution. Specifically, he desired to know the extent of the compact between Lord John and Mr. Bright.

"The noble lord appeals as a proof of his sincerity in his amendment to his long-known and long-tried attachment to the cause of reform. We all know and admit the noble lord's attachment to this question. But we also know that there is a form of the tender passion which sometimes develops itself in jealousy of any attention to the object of its affection from any other quarter. I think, the noble lord exposes himself to some misconstruction on this point. We have heard it said,—

'Strong were his hopes his rival to
remove;
With blandishments to gain the public
love;
To head the faction while their zeal was
hot,
And popularly prosecute the plot.'

(*Laughter.*) Whether this is so or not, I know not; but of this I am sure, that the country will ask—the country have asked already—what are the real intentions of the noble lord, and what are the objects which he proposes to himself in meeting a Bill of this kind, not openly, not broadly, but by an ambiguous and most irregular amendment, which commits nobody and which means nothing that is precise. The people of this country have differed, and they always will differ,

about Reform bills, about theories of representation, about social and domestic legislation of any kind. But there is one subject upon which the people of this country are entirely agreed. They do not like anything which bears the least appearance of or approach to artifice or—I must use a homely phrase—a dodge. They do not like it in business, they do not like it in politics, but least of all will they admire it in a man who, at a time when the best interests of his country at home and our most peaceful hopes abroad demand all the patriotism, all the candour, and all the forbearance of a statesman, approaches the consideration of a great national question like this, not fairly to criticize, not boldly to reject, but with a crafty and catching device to confuse and, if it may be, to dislocate parties, and on that confusion and dislocation to secure his own political aggrandizement and private advantage."—(*Loud cheering.*)

Mr. Walpole thought the present Bill would not be acceptable to the country. He argued in favour of the small borough constituencies and the varied character which the present mixed elements gave to the representation. Neither could he approve of the manner in which it dealt with the franchise. The Government had shown a great desire to give a portion of the franchise to the working classes. But all the old franchises they had altered, and altered for the worse. The leaseholds for years, the copyholds for lives, the freeholds for lives, as settled by the Reform Act, all had this security attached to them, to prevent them from

being mere faggot votes, that the value mentioned in the Act must be a value over and above all rents and charges. In the present Bill the word "rent" was entirely left out. The occupation franchise for boroughs was carefully connected in the Reform Act with houses and buildings. He could not conceive why in the present Bill the words "houses and buildings" were left out—[*An honourable Member*—"To create faggot votes."]—except for this reason. The word "tenement" that is introduced covers many things beside houses and buildings. Then as to uniformity of franchise. This Bill would destroy the distinction between counties and boroughs; lead to the manufacture of votes—an argument against it never answered—destroy the permanent character of constituencies by enfranchising a fluctuating population, and lead to electoral districts. He (Mr. Walpole) would keep up the old distinction between counties and boroughs; reduce the 50*l.* occupation in counties down to 20*l.*—an amount where direct taxation commences with the house-tax, and so taxation and representation would go together—and in boroughs, go to a 6*l.* rating, which would be equivalent to an 8*l.* value, because that is the point where the landlord cannot compound for the tenant's rates. He found it difficult to support the second reading of the Bill. If the Government would declare that all these questions were open to consideration, then he would help them to pass the Bill with amendments. If not, he could not blame Lord John Russell for moving his amendment—an

amendment which was unusual, but not irregular. "I know, it is said," continued Mr. Walpole, "that if you adopt the amendment of the noble lord, the Government may resign—that Parliament may be dissolved—that the Bill may be thrown out. Sir, I should regret as much as any person, if any one of these consequences should follow. I do not believe that they would ensue; nay, more, I believe, that both this House and the country will expect that none of these consequences should follow. I think, that my right honourable friends upon the Treasury bench achieved their position honourably. They have filled it ably, and I trust, they will long continue to hold it with advantage to the country and with credit to themselves. So much for the resignation of the Government. As for the dissolution, bold will be that man who would recommend a dissolution in the present complicated state of European affairs, particularly at a moment when my noble friend, Lord Malmesbury, by his prudence, by his firmness, and sagacity, has placed this country in the position of being the mediator and arbiter of peace. But the strength of that position mainly depends, I have no hesitation in saying, upon my noble friend's still receiving, as he has received, all the weight and authority of Parliament for his proceedings. The other alternative is, that this Bill shall be withdrawn. Well, Sir, as I have said before, it will be a dangerous experiment to throw this question again afloat, to take this or that direction. Depend upon it, you ought to settle it now. You can

settle it, I am persuaded, if you only act fully, fairly, and finally. You who sit upon the Treasury bench have it in your power to settle this question. Great will be the triumph and noble the success if you accomplish its settlement; but tremendous will be your responsibility, if you throw away the opportunity which is now offered to you."

Mr. Bright made an able and temperate speech. He said there were two questions before the House; the Bill, and the Resolution of Lord John Russell. There was a singular unanimity of feeling about the Bill. Every one felt a strong repugnance to some point of the measure. Mr. Horsman seemed to think the Government would accept his suggestion of turning the Bill inside out; but he forgot that they had parted with two eminent colleagues on account of differences on the very points he was discussing. He was astonished that Mr. Horsman should suggest such a course.

"Now, the people out of doors understand by a Reform Bill, a large enfranchisement and larger, freer constituencies. The Bill does not meet that demand. It gets rid of the most independent electors from counties, and insidiously proposes to alter the boundaries of boroughs to complete the work. But not all boroughs. Some boroughs are not towns at all. Droitwich and Petersfield are examples. But, if the line is to be drawn between counties and boroughs, it must be drawn in all cases. The Bill, however, would shut out as many as possible in boroughs in one case, and not interfere in the other. I find

everything has been done in one direction, and one only. The object is to make the representation of counties more exclusively territorial. Is that desirable? Why, the 150 gentlemen elected by the territorial interest have been the chief difficulty in the way of carrying every measure demanded by the country. Ask Lord Lyndhurst, ask Sir James Graham, ask Lord Aberdeen, ask Mr. Disraeli, who in 1852 was turned out, because he was forced to meet the demands of his party with regard to the Malt-tax. Does any one believe that this is the sort of Bill which Mr. Disraeli thinks the best for the country? He knows that the Bill is framed to satisfy the prejudices of the 150 gentlemen who sit behind him. As to the small boroughs, they are only a refuge for the politically destitute—a shelter for what are called 'deserving objects.' What would be the effect of the voting-paper system upon small boroughs? I know no limit whatever to the amount of corruption it may occasion."

Mr. Bright exerted himself to show that the Bill would exclude the working classes; telling them they are dangerous; that there are privileges they ought not to share. He pictured their improved mental, moral, and physical condition; and yet, he said, the Government tells them they are as dangerous and ignorant, as they were twenty-seven years ago! As to uniformity of franchise, he did not see any advantage in it, or great disadvantage. It had been represented as a democratic proceeding. He was not himself very democratic—*(laughter)*—and on that account it had no charms for

him. It would not be so easy to change the whole franchise if the county franchise were different from that of the boroughs. No power could keep the boroughs at 10% ; and unless the idea of uniformity be given up, the county franchise must come down.

It was said nobody cared about reform. Mr. Walpole thought it should be settled this session because he knew the form in which it would be settled was not one satisfactory to the people. There would be agitations during the autumn and winter. "Do not imagine that those changes which become necessary from time to time can be accomplished without that healthy movement, in some cases perhaps approaching to a rude but still a refreshing and strengthening agitation. Are we sure there is nothing in what is going on out of doors? I happen to have visited some of the largest populations of the country, and I have seen meetings exceeding in number and in influence, I believe, almost every meeting that was held by the Anti-Corn Law League during the agitation for the repeal of the corn laws. The populations you are about to disappoint and defy, what have they done? They have conquered everything they have grappled with hitherto. I do not speak of distant realms conquered under your banners, but of arts and manufactures, and all that tends to wealth and civilization. Do you think that this population will not also conquer a much larger share of their political rights than in your present mood you appear disposed to give them?" Addressing the country gentlemen, Mr. Bright said, "The men in the North, eminent

men, conducting vast undertakings, have no fear of the people. A violent disturbance would be more damaging to us than to you ; yet a large proportion of the employers of labour are in favour of extending the suffrage, for they believe it would remove discontent, and elevate and strengthen the people. I assure you that resistance is not always conservative. I profess to be, in intention, as conservative as you. I believe infinitely more so, if you look forward twenty or thirty years into the future. Was not free-trade conservative? And yet you resisted it to the last. I recollect when the Chancellor of the Exchequer used to get up, and with dishevelled hair, tell us of the cruelty practised on the ruined and betrayed agriculturist. Is not prosperity conservative? Is not peace conservative? Any energies I possess I have devoted to their advance ; I have endeavoured to stand on the rules of political economy, and to be guided by the higher rules of true morality ; and when advocating a measure of Reform larger than some are prepared to grant, I appear in that character, for I believe a substantial measure of Reform would elevate and strengthen the character of our population ; that in the language of the beautiful prayer read here every day, it would tend 'to knit together the hearts of all persons and estates within this realm.' I believe it would add to the authority of the decisions of Parliament ; and I feel satisfied it would confer a lustre time could never dim on that benignant reign under which we have the happiness to live." (*Cheers.*)

Sir S. Northcote noticed the

embarrassment in which the Government, as well as the House, was placed in relation to this question, which was sufficiently complicated of itself, owing, among other causes, to the measure not having altogether originated in their spontaneous action, but in the call made upon them. The embarrassment, moreover, was increased by the manner in which the measure had been met and the issue raised. The Resolution of Lord J. Russell was couched in general terms, and offered no alternative. The proposition that the Government should recall the Bill, and alter it in the sense of Mr. Walpole, was one which it would be difficult for the Government to adopt without placing themselves in a false position. The chief objections went to the principle of identity or uniformity of the franchise. He considered these objections, which, he observed, applied either to the principle itself or to the accidents to which its introduction gave rise; and these objections the Government were not precluded from considering in the Committee; on the contrary, the Government would be prepared to consider any amendments in that stage, though he did not speak as a member of the Cabinet. He pointed out the difficult position in which Lord John's Resolution placed members who believed that the Bill, though faulty, admitted of being amended in Committee, yet who could not vote against that Resolution. He urged, likewise, the difficulty of complying with the suggestion of Mr. Walpole, that the Government should give a guarantee, if the Bill passed the second reading, that they would accept any amendments carried in

the Committee, without knowing what they were. After suggesting a variety of reasons in favour of an uniformity of suffrage for all classes of voters, and citing *data* to show that the probable addition to the constituency by the Bill would be one-third, or 300,000, he observed that the Government invited the House to deal with this measure practically; to go into Committee, and there discuss any definite proposals for the amendment of a Bill which contained elements for a settlement of the question.

Mr. Cardwell said he regarded the present Bill as calculated to increase, instead of reducing influence, and to diminish, instead of augmenting, the power of public opinion in that House. The question which lay at the very root of this whole measure, was whether the uniformity of suffrage was a matter of detail or of principle. He contended that variety of franchise was the rule of the Constitution, and that, in order not to unsettle ancient prescription, a Reform Bill should deal with the county franchise according to the history of that franchise, and with the borough franchise according to its own peculiar history. If a new great principle were imparted into the British Constitution, that would become a vital and animated principle, pervading all its parts and affecting all its operations. Comparing the history of this country with that of other countries, it would be found that freedom, not equality, had been the desire of the British people; and equality rather than freedom had been the desire of other countries. The principle of uniformity was wholly foreign to our Constitution, and

dangerous in its consequences ; and, as the Resolution was favourable to an alteration both in the county and the borough franchise, while it was adverse to the principle of uniformity, he should vote for it, and against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Drummond said, when the Bill was in Committee he should be ready to consider favourably the Resolution of Lord J. Russell, but the question now was the second reading of the Bill. A Reform Bill consisted of two parts—one, the extension of the suffrage; the other, the disfranchisement of some places and the enfranchisement of others ; but how far the suffrage should be extended, and how far disfranchisement and enfranchisement should be carried, were questions of degree, and had nothing to do with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Stuart Wortley spoke against the Resolution. If the second reading were carried, the House could amend the Bill—but he asked who was able to give a Reform Bill to the country, if the present Government could not? Whatever might be the result of the discussion, he entreated the Government not to resort to the hazardous step of a dissolution.

Lord Palmerston said he was going to give his cordial support to the Resolution moved by Lord J. Russell. Long as the debate had lasted, and as it was likely to last, he could not say that the time and the attention which the House had bestowed upon the subject had been entirely thrown away. At the beginning they had been led to believe that the identity of the suffrage and the disfranchisement of the borough

freeholders were fundamental principles of the Bill, but he rejoiced to hear that the Government held every part of the Bill to be open to consideration in the Committee, including even the propositions contained in the Resolution. When the present Administration applied themselves to the framing of a measure of Reform, they would naturally discern certain defects and imperfections in the Act of 1832. The county franchise required to be lowered, and, upon further consideration, he was of opinion that the borough franchise should be reduced below 10*l*. Then it would be a question whether there should not be a transference of seats from small constituencies to unrepresented places. Upon this point he was not disposed to quarrel with the Government measure ; and he assigned reasons why, in his opinion, small boroughs should be retained. But the Government had inserted in their Bill provisions totally inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution, committing an act of injustice against those county freeholders who happened to reside in boroughs, and identifying the town and county franchise, thereby destroying an ancient principle of the Constitution, which provided for a marked distinction between them, and actually establishing electoral districts. The principles of the Bill being so unjust, the question was whether the measure ought to be resisted on the second reading, and that had been his first impression ; but he had since thought the most expedient course, under the circumstances, was to propose the amendment, and the Government ought to thank Lord J. Russell

for relieving them from a serious difficulty. In considering the courses the Government might pursue, he believed they would neither resign nor resort to a dissolution; and he felt assured that they would not adopt the course of abandoning the Bill. They would, no doubt, feel it their duty to go on with it, and would, indeed, be bound, and even compelled, to conform to the decision of the House.

Mr. Whiteside admitted, with Lord Palmerston, that Parliament ought to deal with this great question on the principles of the Constitution. After what had been done in the way of Reform, the only question that remained was whether it was not expedient to infuse new blood into the body politic, and extend the area of representation. The present Ministry had produced a measure for these objects, which had been opposed upon conflicting grounds, and had been met by an inscrutable Resolution, to stifle truth and prevent discussion,—a crafty contrivance, he said, to defeat the Bill, and, if possible, the Ministry. The chief ground of attack upon the Bill was the uniformity of the suffrage; but if it was unconstitutional to assimilate the the qualification for the town and the county franchise, that was precisely what Mr. Locke King had done, and that was what Lord J. Russell had proposed to do. Those who had concurred in the disfranchisement of the Irish 40s. freeholders, were not, he observed, the persons to find fault with a provision in this Bill which did not abolish or destroy the franchise of the 40s. freeholders in English boroughs, but only regulated the mode of voting.

But what, it was asked, had been done for the working classes? The Bill did not admit them, as some desired, *en masse*, without restriction or qualification, but it did admit a large number of those classes, and in London the great bulk of skilled artisans would have the franchise. To Lord Palmerston, who had, he said, artfully suggested that the Resolution was never intended to affect the Bill, that the Government might take the Bill and amend it, he gave this plain answer—they would never take the Bill and that offensive Resolution, which was intended for the purpose of spoiling it.

Mr. Edwin James supported the amendment. He agreed in favour of an extension of the borough franchise; and in anticipation of the possible result of a division against the Ministers, he warned Lord John Russell that if he had to construct an Administration, it must not be upon exclusive Whig principles, but upon a broader basis.

Mr. Beaumont, though a supporter of Lord Palmerston and the liberal party, declared his intention of voting against the amendment, the sincerity of which he distrusted.

Lord Elcho regarded the Resolution in the light of a party move, and although he did not approve of the details of the present measure, he believed it was founded upon a sound principle, the representation of interests.

Mr. Ellice thought the measure essentially bad, for its sins of commission and its sins of omission. He regarded the abstraction of the franchise of county voters in boroughs as a confisca-

tion; and though he should have preferred a more simple and general expression of disapprobation of the principles of the Bill, upon the whole he thought it the best course to vote for the amendment.

Sir J. Graham said he wished not to see the day when it became necessary to reconsider the fundamental principles of the Constitution. The measure of 1832 produced an immense change; it had been called a bloodless revolution; it took power from the aristocracy and gave it to the middle classes, its object being to blend property and numbers. Since that period we had enjoyed better legislation, more prosperity, and less civil discord than at any other period of equal duration. Upon the whole, therefore, the experiment had been successful, and he had hoped that it would have been a final one. In this he had been disappointed; and the object of all Reformers should be, when change was required, to prevent the necessity, if possible, of further alterations. In this Bill three principles were contained—namely, identity of suffrage, electoral districts, and voting papers—which had a direct tendency to consequences most to be apprehended, and it seemed as if the Bill—"too clever by half"—had been framed so as to obtain support from every quarter of the House. He avowed that he had had a share in the Resolution; and, as he had been quite prepared to vote against the second reading of the Bill, he explained his reasons for assenting to proceeding by way of Resolution. The Bill proposed, he observed, to remedy the imperfections of the Act of

1832; but its imperfections, so far from being remedied, were aggravated by this Bill. The Act of 1832 was imperfect in fixing the 10*l*. franchise for boroughs and in providing that the boundaries of the different boroughs should be fixed by Royal Commissioners; and this was to be repeated, the operation being exposed to all the obloquy of the former. After noticing other objectionable features in the Bill, he observed that, if the borough franchise were lowered, it should be to such a point as would render ulterior changes unnecessary; and he said distinctly that, as the ancient borough franchise rested upon rating, he was of opinion that the municipal franchise was a good franchise for the Parliamentary constituency in boroughs. He had the strongest objection to the proposition of voting papers, because he objected to the ballot; but he should not be candid if he did not state that, in the place he represented, no object of Reform had made more rapid progress than the demand for secret voting. He lamented it, and was not a convert to it; but he stated it as a fact; and he was persuaded that the system of voting papers would so organize intimidation and bribery that it would create a general demand for the ballot. He objected likewise to the lodger's vote, suggesting objections to the other miscellaneous franchises; and, in conclusion, he warned the Government that if they rejected the Resolution, which was a milder course than that of negating the second reading of the Bill, they would incur a heavy responsibility, and must make up their minds to encounter all the difficulties and

dangers attending that determination.

Sir J. Pakington, in replying to Sir J. Graham, complained of the course taken by Lord J. Russell in raising a debate upon an abstract Resolution, instead of meeting the Bill with a direct negative. He had taken some pains to ascertain from the highest authority how far the noble lord's proceedings were consistent with the usual practice of the House, and he had no hesitation in declaring that they were irregular and unparliamentary. The right hon. baronet proceeded to comment upon the objections which had been made to the Bill, deprecating particularly the speech of Lord Palmerston, who, he said, had adopted a tone of arrogance altogether unusual between gentlemen who sat opposite to each other in that House. He could look upon his language in no other light than as wanting in due respect to the Crown. With regard to the amendment of Lord John Russell, he (Sir J. Pakington) only attributed it to the persuasion that the noble lord did not dare to meet the Bill fairly and boldly.

Mr. Gladstone remarked that there had been a singular coincidence of opinion on all sides with respect to the great question of Parliamentary Reform. Opinions varied within moderate and reasonable limits, and afforded hopes of an early and satisfactory settlement. There was no controversy traceable to differences between political parties, and it was to be regretted that the House was now in hostile conflict with a division before them, which would estrange those by whose united efforts alone a satisfactory settlement could be come

to. With regard to the Resolution, it was unprecedented in form, being an amendment on the second reading of a Bill, referring to a portion of the measure that might be dealt with in Committee. While Lord Palmerston recommended the Government to accept the Resolution, and proceed with the Bill, Lord J. Russell's object was not only to pass the Resolution, but to reject the Bill. These declarations from the two leaders did not indicate a deeply-laid plot for a joint attack, to be followed by the occupation of office.

Now, if we could have a strong Government, Mr. Gladstone would have been induced to vote for the Resolution; but he found only a limited agreement, and he saw that after carrying the Resolution the Opposition would pursue separate courses. The Government were responsible for the embarrassment, because they did not take the wise advice of Mr. Henley and Mr. Walpole. But that was past. The Government were now responsible for the Bill, and the House for what it should do in respect of the Bill. The Government had a claim upon the House, and nothing should be done, except what was absolutely necessary, to intercept the progress of the Bill. Mr. Gladstone then pictured the failures of preceding Governments greatly to the amusement of the House. "In 1851 my noble friend, then the first Minister of the Crown, approached the question of Reform, and commenced with a promise of what was to be done twelve months afterwards. In 1852 he brought in a Bill, and it disappeared, together with the Ministry. In 1853 we had the

Ministry of Lord Aberdeen, which commenced with a promise of Reform in twelve months time. Well, 1854 arrived; with it arrived the Bill, but with it also arrived the war, and in the war was a reason, and I believe a good reason, for abandoning the Bill. Then came the Government of my noble friend the member for Tiverton, which was not less unfortunate in the circumstances which prevented the redemption of those pledges that had been [given to the people from the mouth of the Sovereign on the throne. In 1855 my noble friend escaped all responsibility for a Reform Bill on account of the war; in 1856 he escaped all responsibility for Reform on account of the peace—(*laughter*)—in 1857 he escaped that inconvenient responsibility by the dissolution of Parliament; and in 1858 he escaped again by the dissolution of his Government.—(*Renewed laughter.*) This series of events strengthens the misgivings of the people that the House is reluctant to deal with the question, makes it more hazardous to interpose obstacles, and requires the progress of this Bill to completion. Now the Government have announced that if the Resolution be passed their Bill cannot proceed. They may be right or wrong, but that is their view. And therefore the question is whether the Bill should go into Committee, or not go into Committee. What is the Bill?" He concurred in nearly everything that had been said against it. "I cannot be a party to the disfranchisement of the county freeholders residing in boroughs. I cannot be a party to the uniformity of the franchise. I can-

not be a party to a Reform Bill which does not lower the suffrage in boroughs. I may go a step further, and say it appears to me that the lowering of the suffrage in boroughs is the main purpose of having a Reform Bill, and that unless we are to have that lowering of the suffrage, it would be better that we should not waste our time on this subject." He was bound also to say that he approved of that portion of the Bill relating to the re-distribution of seats. He understood Lord Palmerston to approve of it. [Lord Palmerston assented.] The question of re-distribution of seats was full half the measure. The Bill of 1854 would have failed, because it proposed extensive disfranchisement. Here Mr. Gladstone went into a defence of the small boroughs. He regarded them as the means of supplying the race of men who were trained to carry on the government of the country, the masters of civil wisdom, like Mr. Burke Sir James Macintosh. Mr. Pelham, Lord Chatham, Mr. Fox, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Canning, Sir Robert Peel, all of whom first sat for small boroughs. If there was to be no ingress to the House but one, and that one the suffrages of a large mass of voters, there would be a dead level of mediocrity. The extension, the durability of our liberty, were to be attributed, under Providence, to distinguished statesmen introduced to the House at an early age. But large constituencies would not return boys, and therefore he hoped the small boroughs would be retained. These facts formed a reason for going into Committee. What practical advantage did Lord J. Rus-

sell propose from his Resolution? He could carry his views in Committee; but if he pressed his Resolution, many who agreed with it would vote against it. Lord John said he proposed it to avoid misconception, but he had not escaped cavil. If the Resolution had not been moved, Lord John and his friends would have been the "masters of the situation." If the Resolution were not passed, they would obtain the objects they sought. But if they passed the Resolution, the next step would not rest with them. The Resolution could have no other effect than that of retarding a settlement of the question. They should consider, in looking to consequences, not the interest of the Government, but of Reform itself. The question of the fate of the Ministry had been pushed too far. Mr. Walpole's picture of Lord Malmesbury as the mediator of Europe, for instance, was too warm in its colouring. It was not the question of the Government, but of Reform. A dissolution would be an evil; a resignation would not contribute to the settlement of the question. It was now in the hands of the House; its further postponement they would have to regret; admitting there was no combination, a majority would be a misfortune to all except Mr. Bright, who had said that he did not wish the matter to be settled now. There was a golden opportunity: the House should not let it slip. Mr. Gladstone would not be governed by any other consideration than the simple one—what course would most tend to settle the question. He should, therefore, give his vote neither to the Government nor to

party, when he voted to negative the Resolution of Lord John Russell.

Sir R. Peel said, after this Bill had been dissected and disembowelled, he should enter into no long disquisition, nor philosophize, like the Secretary for the Colonies, upon this middle-class Bill. He asked the House this simple question, "Where are we?" He had listened to the debate from the first, and was bewildered by the confused conflict of opinions, and he gave some amusing examples of this discord on the same side of the House. The Resolution, he observed, was open, at first sight, to some objection, as affirming an abstract proposition. But, if adopted, Lord J. Russell would lay a Bill of his own upon the table, and would, no doubt, give a pledge to the House that he would do so. The Bill pretended to amend the representation; but while it unsettled the existing system, it did not admit to the franchise any portion of the industrious classes; it disfranchised the borough freeholders, it retained the small boroughs, and it introduced the objectionable scheme of voting-papers. The Resolution contained principles not found in the Bill, and he called upon the House, if it desired a measure of Reform founded upon true principles, to confide the task to other and abler hands.

Mr. Henley said he had listened with great attention to the whole of the debate, and if he had heard anything to shake his opinion he should not hesitate to say so. This was in his opinion, a very large measure,—large in itself and in the principle it contained. He proceeded

to analyze the Bill with great minuteness of criticism, stating his objections to it. In considering the amendment, which was the real question before the House, he observed that the first part of the Resolution was met by the clauses brought forward by the Government; and the last part was as vague as possible, so much so that no human being could assign any definite meaning to it. Then, what did the Government say? If he interpreted it rightly, they had said as much as they could be expected to say, and as much as would relieve the House from any difficulty in voting for the second reading of the Bill. He was ready to go into Committee upon it, and he hoped when it got there, the opinions of the House would have their weight with the Government, and that the Bill would be put into a shape that would satisfy the more moderate people,—all would not be satisfied with any measure. He concluded with a strong denunciation of all changes that would assimilate our mixed constitution to that of the United States on the one hand, or that of France on the other.

Mr. Roebuck said, they were about to reform the Reform Act, and the questions were—what was it that required reform, and what were the means to attain the end? One great blemish in the Reform Act of 1832 was the exclusion from power of the working classes. These classes had since been increasing in intelligence, showing themselves worthy of participating in power with the other classes, and the two great objects of any Reform Bill were, to extend the suffrage

to the working classes, and to regulate the distribution of the electoral bodies. Did the Bill of the Government attain either end? He believed that it would be anything but satisfactory to the working classes; but he believed, in opposition to Mr. Bright, that good could be got from the Bill. He proceeded to consider how this could be done, passing under review the merits, as reformers, of Lord Palmerston and Lord J. Russell, expressing no implicit confidence in either; and he asked the Government whether, if the Bill went into Committee, and the House enacted that the borough franchise should be 6*l.*, the county franchise being 10*l.*, they would accept this alteration? If they would, he said, he was ready to vote for the second reading of the Bill.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, this Bill was founded upon three great principles—first, that the constituent body of the country should be increased by the introduction of a large number of persons, making as great an addition to the constituency as was made by the Act of 1832. The second great principle was, that large communities were entitled to direct representation in that House. The third great principle was, to maintain generally the present borough system of representation. These were the principles of the Bill; all the rest was matter of detail only, to be properly discussed in the Committee. In reply to Mr. Roebuck, he said, to every proposition, irrespective of the three principles, the Government would give a candid consideration; but he declined to pledge himself, be-

fore any discussion took place, to adopt whatever decision the Committee might come to—a demand that was unreasonable. The Resolution contained only points of detail which ought to be considered in the Committee. He denied that there was any disfranchisement in the Bill; but, admitting there was, Lord J. Russell had been the proposer of wholesale disfranchisement.

Upon the subject of the franchise, Mr. Disraeli descanted at great length; gave a long history of the 10% country franchise propositions; told Lord Palmerston that the Conservatives had once saved him on that question; and reproached him for not having last session extended the same courtesy to the Government of Lord Derby when it was hard pressed by Mr. Locke King. Mr. Disraeli went into this statement to show how impracticable it would have been to have proposed a 20% franchise. If he had done so the struggle would have taken place on that point. As for the 10% franchise, Mr. Disraeli knew all the tricks that could be played with it, how it could be managed. It would have been a feeble, a dangerous, and a foolish policy to have proposed a 20% county, and 6% borough franchise. Lord John Russell was for admitting the working classes—*how*, he had not explained. Sir James Graham was pledged to the municipal franchise; and as the two were clearly conspirators in drawing up the Resolution, it was an irresistible inference that Lord John was pledged to the political programme of Sir James. Now, in what did Mr. Bright's pro-

VOL. CI.

gramme exceed that of the confederates? Mr. Bright would not decline to act with the noble lord. There were open questions in all Cabinets; and, practically speaking, on the programme, he saw no reason whatever why the honourable member for Birmingham should not be adopted as a trusted and honoured colleague of the right honourable gentleman, and of the noble lord. What Mr. Disraeli could not reconcile was the mild Conservatism of Lord Palmerston, and some distinguished colleagues of Lord Aberdeen, with the avowed, the determined, the advanced policy of the confederates of Mr. Bright. Mr. Disraeli declaimed against democracies, which have their parasites as well as aristocracies, eulogized our mixed constitution, and defended the provisions he had made in his Bill for the representation of interests, insisting that among those admitted were the working classes. He made a personal attack upon Lord Palmerston for his speech, and upon Lord John Russell, for living in an atmosphere of combinations and cunning Resolutions when out of office. He said, that by bringing forward this untoward motion, and by sneering at Lord Malmesbury, at a moment when negotiations were pending, when an awful responsibility rested on the Minister, when Lord John Russell's constituents implored the Chancellor of the Exchequer for "peace," Lord John had not only embarrassed the Government, but injured the public service. The Government thought they had secured peace. He thought the time had arrived when he might have come down

[G]

to the House and told them, that the dark disquietude which for three months had hung over Europe, had entirely passed away. But for this untoward and unhappy motion of the noble lord, that might have been.

Mr. Disraeli terminated his speech by glorifying the deeds of the Derby Administration, and making some vague allusions to a dissolution. The Government had been sustained in all its arduous struggles, by a conviction of the justice of the people of England; and were sustained by it at that moment, amid all the manœuvres of Parliamentary intrigue, and all the machinations of party warfare.

At the conclusion of this speech the House proceeded to a division. Great excitement prevailed on all sides of the House, and the result was a matter of uncertain speculation to the last. At length the numbers were announced as follows :—

For the second reading..... 291
Against it 330

Majority against the Govern-
ment 39

Mr. Wyld then moved a resolution in favour of vote by ballot, but the confusion was too great for a discussion on the subject; and after several ineffectual attempts on the part of Members to be heard, the House again divided on Mr. Wyld's motion, which was negatived by 328 to 98, and Lord J. Russell's Resolution was agreed to.

The division against the Government was followed by the usual consequences. It took place on Thursday, the 1st of April. The House of Commons was adjourned till the Monday

following; but in the House of Lords, which met on Friday the 2nd, the Earl of Derby briefly communicated to their lordships the steps which the Ministers had resolved upon in consequence of their recent defeat. The noble earl stated that he had called his colleagues together on that morning, and after the meeting of the Cabinet had had an audience of Her Majesty at Buckingham Palace. At present he was not at liberty to state to the House what had taken place; but he proposed on the Monday following to make a statement on the subject, and lay before them the advice which he and his colleagues had submitted to Her Majesty, and the course which with Her Majesty's sanction they intended to adopt. Accordingly on that evening, Lord Derby rose and proceeded to lay before their lordships his promised explanation. It would be fresh in their recollection, he said, that on the Thursday preceding, the House of Commons had after a debate of seven nights, characterized by the greatest ability on both sides, adopted the Resolution moved by Lord John Russell, and pronounced a decision adverse to the Bill for amending the representation of the people. There were, continued the noble lord, in consequence of this decision, but two alternatives left for himself and colleagues,—either to resign office, or to dissolve the present Parliament and appeal to the country. It had been suggested, both by their friends and by their enemies, that another course was open to the Government, but such a course would not have been respectful to the House of

Commons, nor in unison with constitutional practice. Besides, it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to conceal from themselves that the vote of the House of Commons was equivalent to a vote of want of confidence, and he thought the Government would have laid themselves open to a charge of indifference if they took no notice of such a decision. Before stating the course which the Government intended to pursue, he begged their lordships to remember the circumstances under which he had accepted office, and the difficulties with which he had had to contend. The present distracted state of parties in the House of Commons rendered it almost impossible to administer the affairs of the nation. He excepted, indeed, the Conservative party from this censure, whose unwavering, cordial, and generous support he had received for so many years, and then proceeded to enumerate the various political achievements of Lord John Russell, whose ability and energy as an advocate of Reform every one would acknowledge, but whose attentions resembled more the zeal of a lover than the judicious superintendence of a parent. It had been the peculiar fortune of Lord John Russell, from the restless energy of his disposition, to overthrow many Governments, not only of his opponents, but also of his friends. The consequence of such conduct was that hardly a year now passed without a Ministerial crisis; and if the system were persevered in, it would put an end to all government, for it inflicted injury at home and damaged the influence of the country abroad.

In accepting office, he had endeavoured to carry on the Government not by embittering, but by conciliating all parties, until a party should be formed capable of carrying out a fixed and definite policy. One of the questions bequeathed to him by the late Government was the *damnosa hereditas* of Parliamentary Reform. He had in consequence introduced a Bill to meet that question. The way that Bill had been received was well known to their lordships. It had not been suffered to be read a second time, and to be amended in Committee, but had been met by a Resolution, which, according to some authorities, was contrary to Parliamentary practice, and had been swamped without discussion. Had the Bill been proceeded with in Committee, he and his colleagues were prepared to vindicate its principles as well as to consider proposed alterations, which, if admissible, no false pride would have prevented them from accepting. An opportunity had thus been given to the House of Commons to settle this question, but they had preferred the interests of party to the interests of the country. In his speech in the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston had said that the Government should be condemned to keep their places and do "*our*" bidding; but he begged to tell Lord Palmerston, they would do no one's bidding, but that of the Queen as long as they retained her confidence. But whose bidding were they to do? Was it that of the Liberal party, who were of such motley and heterogeneous materials that he did not know what its bidding was? He would not disguise

[G 2]

from the House the difficulty in which the Cabinet was placed by the refusal of the second reading of the Bill. There were but two courses open to them,—the first was to dissolve Parliament; and the second to tender their resignation to Her Majesty. Considering, however, the present grave condition of European affairs, and the domestic interests of the country, he had deemed it his duty to recommend to Her Majesty as early a dissolution of Parliament as was consistent with the public service. Her Majesty had consented to this proposal, and he looked with confidence to the appeal about to be made to the country. The Ministers, he considered, had redeemed their promise by the introduction of the Bill, and held themselves free on that ground. He was not afraid to go to the hustings on this question, for the measure, which had been by the decision of the other House deferred to another session, was a large and liberal measure; much mischief had been done by that decision, and no principle produced on which a future Reform Bill could be based. It was not, however, on the Reform question only he appealed to the country, but he appealed to them as Englishmen and lovers of fair play, whether they would sanction the overthrow of a Government, which had been defeated not by fair Parliamentary opposition, but by what, not to use an offensive term, he would call an ingenious manœuvre.

Lord Granville agreed with Lord Derby in his opinion about parties, but still thought that Government should have a sufficient majority in the House of

Commons to carry out a policy of their own. He vindicated Lord John Russell from the severe but inaccurate statement of Lord Derby. He could not admit that the present Government had a monopoly of maintaining peace in Europe, and thought there were statesmen in both Houses of Parliament as capable to do so as the present Ministry. In respect to the Reform Bill, there was not a single person, except those in the Government, who did not object to the Bill, and now he was glad to see that Lord Derby himself was prepared to abandon it. He was not afraid of an appeal to the country, but the adoption of such a course threw a grave responsibility on those who advised it. What was the Cabinet going to the country for? To confirm their policy? The present Cabinet had no policy, but wanted the country to make one for it. In his opinion, it would have better become a great statesman boldly to announce to the nation what policy he intended to adopt.

No further discussion on the subject occurred in the House of Lords, but in the House of Commons on the same evening another Ministerial explanation and a more general debate on the policy and intentions of the Government took place.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, moving, as a matter of form, that the House do adjourn, announced that after the vote of the House on the previous Thursday, it was not the intention of the Government to proceed with their Bill to amend the representation of the people, or to propose any other measure with the same object. He pro-

tested against the doctrine that the question of Parliamentary Reform was the appanage of any individual, or the privilege of any particular party. It was in the power of the Government to deal with this or any other public question in the manner which they deemed most expedient for the public welfare, or most conducive to the public interests. The question of Parliamentary Reform, he observed, might be viewed in two lights, conservative and revolutionary. Those who regarded it, like the Government, in the first point of view, would wish, in any change, to preserve the present character of the House of Commons, as representing various interests; those who looked at it in the other light would attempt to change its character, and make it the representative of the voice of the numerical majority. The vote of the House had rendered it necessary for the Government to consider their position in that House; and, influenced by powerful considerations, they had determined to retain their offices under circumstances which, he admitted, involved a degree of mortification, but with a feeling that, on the whole, they were doing their duty to the country. He offered acknowledgments to Members on the benches behind him, and to Members who sat below the gangway, for their support, and to the House generally, especially the Opposition, for the courtesy and kind feeling with which they had supported him as leader of the House, with a numerical minority. In their present position he would state the course which the Government felt it to be their duty to

take. Considering the state of parties in that House; that a number of sections of Members could at any moment combine and overthrow the Queen's Government in whatever hands, and believing that such a state of affairs was prejudicial to the reputation of Parliament and to the best interests of the empire, and that it was important that the authority of the Government should be supported by the authority of Parliament, the Government had advised Her Majesty, who had adopted and sanctioned this advice, to exercise her prerogative, and by dissolving the present Parliament, to recur to the sense of her people. Under these circumstances, it was his duty to inform the House that, as soon as the urgent requirements of the public service were satisfied, Parliament would be prorogued, with a view to its immediate dissolution.

Lord Palmerston said he was sure he expressed the general feeling of the House in acknowledging the courtesy and fairness of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did not taunt the Government with remaining in power in their present circumstances, for he did not consider the late vote as one of censure; as such he would not have supported it; it was only an expression of the feeling of the House upon a measure, or parts of a measure, before it. His opinion was, that if the Government felt it their duty to retain their office, they should either have withdrawn the Bill or altered it in Committee, so as to adapt it to the opinion of the House, and he did not think that to pursue either course would be any disparagement to political

honour. He did not offer any obstacle to their carrying out the advice they had given to Her Majesty; but he thought it was very unwise advice. The question that would be put to the country was, not what men should be in office, but what should be the Reform Bill to be brought in by the Government. If he were to attempt to prophesy the result, he should say that the Parliament which the present Government would call together would be far more likely than the present to decide that power ought to be transferred to other hands. He entreated them to take the earliest moment to dissolve Parliament; great embarrassment and inconvenience would result from delay.

Mr. Bright felt, with many Members, that the course adopted by the Government would lead to a large amount of personal inconvenience; but, under all the circumstances of the case, it was impossible for him to come to any other conclusion than that the Government had taken the constitutional course they were bound to take. They had been defeated by a majority exceeding one-half of the Members of the House, and the question ought to be remitted to the constituencies before it was reproduced for adjudication there. But while he applauded the course they had taken, he protested against the attempt of Mr. Disraeli to get up a little political capital by representing that the country had the option between his own measure, conservative in its character, and one that was revolutionary. It was very odd, he remarked, that his Conservative Bill should have had more determined opponents on his own side of the House than on the other.

He (Mr. Bright) was not afraid of the tribunal before which the Government were about to bring this question. Any measure of Reform he should propose would be in the lines of that of 1832; if that would be revolutionary, he did not understand the meaning of the term. He warned the members of the Government, when they went to the hustings, against making such a charge as this; if they did so, they must take the consequences. He should like to go to this election in a spirit of calmness, and, the Government giving all the figures, to discuss the question fairly.

Lord J. Russell observed that if, as Mr. Disraeli contended, it was competent to any person or party to introduce a measure of Reform, it was equally competent to any person or party to judge of and oppose it; but this privilege Mr. Disraeli seemed to deny him, by censuring him for his opposition to the Bill—an opposition which, he had stated, was dangerous to the peace of Europe. If this were so, the responsibility would rest upon the Government who brought in such a Bill. But he believed that the opposition to the Bill would have no influence whatever upon the peace of Europe. Considering the state of public business and that of affairs abroad, he thought the Government should have exhausted every means of settling this question before they resorted to a dissolution. He stated his notions of what a Reform Bill should be; that he should propose a 10*l.* franchise for counties, and to reduce the yearly value for boroughs from 10*l.* to 6*l.*; and he believed it was desirable to introduce a large body of the working classes.

into the constituent body. The question of disfranchisement and redistribution of seats was, he remarked, encompassed with the greatest difficulties. If 26 seats were taken away, with the four vacant, there would be 30 to be distributed. Such a Reform Bill would, in his opinion, settle the question for some time to come. In reply to a question about the ballot, he said, if the present Ministers introduced a new Reform Bill, with the ballot, he should vote against it.

A discussion of some length, and of a miscellaneous character, ensued; in the course of which, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the prorogation would probably take place at about the usual time of the adjournment for Easter. He said there was no foundation for the statement that the Ministers had contemplated resigning office. And he denied that he had stated that the opposition to the Bill had endangered the peace of Europe. The discussion then terminated.

The demise of the Parliament being thus near at hand, and the attention of the great majority of its Members being concentrated on the prospects of their re-election, the short remaining period of its existence was devoted only to those subjects upon which there was an urgent need for legislative action. It was necessary that certain votes of money should be passed for the various emergencies of public service; that the Mutiny Bills should be passed, and that various annual Continuance Acts, and Acts for amending some pressing defects in the law should receive the Royal Assent before the dissolution took place. In one case

only, the Government desired to press forward an original measure of importance, the postponement of which, on account of financial reasons, would have led to inconvenience. This was the Bill for authorizing a loan to the East India Government, which had passed through the stages of second reading and Committee before the division on the Reform Bill.

In moving the third reading of this Bill, on the evening of the 8th of April, Lord Stanley said it would be necessary to make a demand upon the House for larger borrowing powers for India than he had calculated two months before. He entered into long and detailed explanations regarding the finances of India, the difficulties pressing upon which, he said, were of an exceptional and temporary character. He observed that the borrowing powers of the Indian Government, in India, had been very considerably diminished. This had arisen from one of three causes—namely, the actual want of capital in the country, or the absence of confidence in the stability of the Government, or the holding back of capitalists in the hope of a better investment. The last was, in his opinion, the only true solution of the question. After stating the amount of the deficiency of means of the Indian Government, he showed that this exigency did not involve a deficit of revenue to that extent. Until the arrival of more accurate information he should mislead the House, he said, if he mentioned any specific sum that would be required. He did not propose to re-commit the Bill for the purpose of enlarging the limit of the loan, or to intro-

duce another Bill before the prorogation.

Mr. Crawford condemned the recent financial operations in India. He did not view the financial condition of that country with despondency; on the contrary, he looked at its revenues with confidence. He thought the whole question resolved itself into one of expenditure.

Sir C. Wood justified the measures resorted to in 1853 to reduce the interest of the Indian debt, and re-asserted his somewhat gloomy estimate of the Indian revenue. He censured severely the financial operations of the Indian Government, sanctioned by that at home. The future prospects of the resources of India, he observed, were discouraging; there would be a deficiency of revenue in a year of peace of upwards of 6,500,000*l.*, exclusive of home charges. With so large an excess of charge, active measures must be taken for reducing the expenditure.

Mr. T. Baring was of opinion that the attempt to reduce the debt of India in 1853, which could not be permanently maintained, threw distrust upon the management of the Indian finances. These finances could be righted only by economy. He thought that the refusal of an Imperial guarantee of Indian loans was an unwise and uneconomical policy.

Sir G. Lewis said the late Government had recommended no novel course in withholding a guarantee by the Imperial Exchequer, since they had simply pursued the invariable practice. The loan had not been obtained at a high rate of interest; the Four per Cent. Bonds had been

issued nearly at par. It was the duty of the House to enforce upon the Executive Government that they must teach that of India the necessity of finding means of bringing the ordinary expenditure within the amount of the revenue.

Mr. Baillie said the expenditure in India could be reduced only by a very large reduction of the European army. It was impossible to say, at present, what the extent of the reduction could be.

Colonel Sykes insisted that England, being the party benefited by the possession of India, should not refuse to bear the responsibility of the loans in case of emergency.

Sir H. Willoughby observed that it was clear that, unless the military expenditure was limited, the insolvency of the Indian finances was inevitable. The best aid we could afford to those finances was by the Imperial Exchequer bearing a fair proportion of that expenditure. After some further explanations from Lord Stanley, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Before the Houses separated, one matter of grave interest seemed to call for discussion. This was the state of negotiations respecting the affairs of Italy—a subject which filled the minds of most men with anxious apprehension, the prospect of an European war, in which this country might possibly be involved, being by many persons regarded as imminent. It was generally felt that before the Legislative power of the country was put into abeyance, some explanation from Her Majesty's Government was called for upon

the existing state of Italian affairs, and upon the attitude which our own Government was disposed to assume with respect to them. The Ministers, on their part, were not backward in responding to this call, and on the 18th of April the attention of both Houses was invited to a consideration of the relations between France, Italy, and Austria, and of the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government in regard thereto. The Earl of Malmesbury, in introducing the subject in the House of Lords, said, it would be fresh in the memory of the House that in the beginning of this year a conversation had occurred, which showed that the relations between France and Austria were not on so satisfactory a footing as could have been desired, while the relations of this country with all parts of the world were so encouraging, that we were well fitted to take the part of mediators. He then briefly reviewed the position of the three principal Powers in regard to this country, and observed that, although connected with Austria by similarity of race and an ancient alliance, the people of this country were alienated from her by the policy which Austria had pursued in Italy. No statesman in this country would for a minute deny the rights of Austria—rights which had been acquired by conquest, inheritance, and treaty, precisely in the same way as this country held many of its own possessions. These rights were secured by treaties which we had signed, and which every Government was bound to uphold. But a true cause of complaint against Austria arose from her interference with

the other Italian States besides Lombardy. In passing to Sardinia, he said that a strong feeling in her favour existed in this country by the assimilation of her institutions to our own, and he regretted that, after her noble conduct in the late war, she should have so far forgotten that military glory ought not to be the sole object of a Government, for it was from this cause that the present difficulties had arisen. It was difficult, he observed, to understand why France should involve itself in this question; but France had thought fit to unite her cause with Sardinia, and to assert her right to look into the affairs of Italy in opposition to Austria. Such was the state of affairs in the month of February, at which period Lord Cowley was despatched to Vienna. Thoroughly conversant with the views of the French Government in regard to the Italian question, Lord Cowley had calmly, and as a friend, discussed the subject with Count Buol. It was a matter for regret that Lord Cowley had not been allowed then and there to mediate, as there would have been more chance of a successful result than at present. Lord Cowley, on his return from Paris, found that negotiations had been going on between France and Russia during his absence, the consequence of which was a proposal from Russia that a Congress of the five great Powers should be held, to which proposal Her Majesty's Government had agreed, as they felt they should incur too heavy a responsibility by refusing. On the 22nd of March, Baron Brunow had proposed to him the bases on which

the Congress should take place, to which he (Lord Malmesbury) added the stipulation that the treaties of 1815 should be undisturbed. To these stipulations the five Powers had agreed, but subsequently two collateral questions arose as to the composition of the Congress, and the disarmament of the Powers antagonistic to each other. Much discussion had taken place on these points, the latter of which had, he regretted to say, not been yet settled. It was the opinion, however, of Her Majesty's Government that a disarmament was necessary previous to the assembling of the Congress. The Congress was to consist of the five great Powers; but, as the questions to be considered affected the social and political importance of Italy, he thought that the different Italian nations should be represented, and it had, therefore, been proposed that these nations should be invited to attend, and admitted when the Congress wished to hear them. There were two precedents for this course—the Congress of Laybach and the Congress of 1830, to settle the disputes between Belgium and Holland. In such a decision there was nothing derogatory to the dignity of the Italian States. Sardinia would, therefore, not be represented in the Congress, but invited with the other Italian States to send a delegate to put its wishes before the Congress. Narrating the different proposals and counter-proposals which had been made on the question of a disarmament, the noble lord informed the House that Austria and France had agreed to the principle of a disarmament, but differed as to the time and

mode of carrying it out. It was his opinion that it would be much better to submit this point to a commission, in order that on its meeting Congress should discuss purely political subjects. Sardinia had also been invited to disarm on the same footing as Austria, but refused on the ground of her non-admission to the Congress. He regretted that he could not give a more satisfactory account of these negotiations, but it might be presumed that for their own credit the Government had used every effort to avert a war which would be no common one, but would be a theatre for the dreams of the wildest theorists and the most unprincipled adventurers.

The Earl of Clarendon wished that Lord Malmesbury could have made a more satisfactory statement previous to the dissolution of Parliament, in order to allay public anxiety. Assuming, he said, that the various Governments were sincere, and not pursuing a policy they were ashamed to avow, it was hard to conceive how matters had arrived at their present state. They had all declared their intention of not attacking each other; England and Prussia had done their best to mediate, but still armaments were going on among them. In France everything denoted a campaign; Sardinia was draining her resources to support her army, and the war-spirit of Germany could be hardly repressed; and yet although they were all clamorous for a Congress, they could not agree on the conditions on which that Congress was to meet. Passing to the discussions that had taken place as to a general disarmament, he thought that matters

had gone too far, for none of the parties would now trust each other. If, however, there existed a real desire for peace, the whole business might be concluded by a Congress in a fortnight. At present it was hard to know what a Congress was wanted for. If it were to alter the territories of Austria in Italy, Austria would not recognize the power of the Congress of 1859 to abrogate the settlements of the Congress of 1815. If it were that Austria was to abandon the Papal territory, Austria was ready to do so if France would abandon Rome. He agreed with Lord Malmesbury that Lord Cowley might have finished this business satisfactorily at Vienna, if he had had the power. He objected to the alteration of the treaties of Vienna, for he thought they had answered their object in preserving the peace of Europe. The object of these treaties, he explained, had been to create a barrier against France in the North of Italy, and it was by the universal wish of Europe that Austria had been secured in her possessions there. So far as Austria stood on treaties, she ought to receive the support of the other Powers; but she had no right to transgress the limits of the territory assigned her, and ought not to be allowed to reduce the other States of Italy to a condition of political vassalage. He considered France was responsible for the defects of the Papal Government, and he could not imagine a great nation in a more unworthy position. He did not fear the withdrawal of the French and Austrian troops from the Papal States, for he believed that the party of order and

constitutional government was increasing in influence in those States. The bubble of Italian unity had at length burst, and the detestable party of Mazzini and his accomplices were almost extinct. He could not conceive what was the necessity for war. War could not settle the Italian question; for, supposing that Austria was driven out, and Lombardy was annexed to Piedmont, the people of Milan and Venice would never agree with those of Sardinia, but would be even more discontented than they were now. But, in fact, Piedmont had been nothing more in this matter than the advanced guard of France, and he considered that in case of Austrian defeat only one master would be substituted for another. There was one principle he hoped the Congress would establish—that of non-intervention—for the Italians were quite capable of conducting their own affairs. Trusting that Lord Malmesbury would carry to the Congress with him the whole moral support of this country, he assured him that no party spirit would prevent him from making every allowance for the difficulties of this subject, and that he should be only too glad to hear of his success.

The Earl of Derby thanked Lord Clarendon and Parliament for not embarrassing Government in the present condition of affairs, as the best chance of maintaining peace was that it should be well understood by Europe that no differences existed on that point in the English Parliament. There could be no doubt, after the stipulation added by the Foreign Secretary to the four points of Baron Brunow, of the

intention of this country, and of the four great Powers who had consented to that stipulation, to maintain the treaties of 1815; it was, indeed, a *sine quâ non* of the Congress. The course taken by the Ministry had been one calculated to prevent war in Europe, but he could not help concurring that there might have been a greater chance of success if the matter had been left in the hands of Lord Cowley, who had succeeded in laying down bases on which France and Austria were disposed to treat. The proposal of Russia, from which it was impossible for the Government to have withheld their consent, had introduced all the subsequent difficulties. He quite agreed that it did seem hard to reconcile the express desire for a Congress with the military preparations on both sides. Much of these difficulties was due to the King of Sardinia's words, that "a cry of anguish came from Italy, and he could not endure it." When such words were used it was not unnatural that Austria should make preparations on a large scale, although Piedmont had nothing to fear from Austria as long as she kept within her own bounds. He agreed with Lord Clarendon as to the injurious results of the treaties which Austria had entered into with the Italian States, and thought it would be wise for her to reconsider them. In regard to the Papal States, he thought that it would be best to leave that matter to France and Austria during the Congress, allowing the Pope a voice in the question. The time was now nearly come, he said, when it was a question whether a Congress should be held at all, and when

the terms on which such a Congress should be held ought to be known. The time, in fact, was nearly at hand when England would have to say that the season for trifling had gone by, and she would therefore withdraw from interfering in affairs where she could not do so effectually. If there were a war (which God forbid!), it would not be localized in Italy; it would be impossible to confine it to that country; it would extend itself, and involve the world in universal conflagration. It would, in accordance with treaties, bring the whole of Germany into the field, and it would be impossible for this country to look unmoved on the occupation of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, and equally impossible to confine such a war within limits or to foresee who would be drawn into its vortex. The policy of this country in such an event was neutrality—but if neutrality, it must be an armed neutrality; and he hoped that this decision of Her Majesty's Government would meet with the assent of Parliament. He trusted that the storm might pass without breaking. The chance of peace, however, would be immeasurably strengthened in Europe, if it were known that this country would not remain an unmoved spectator of any event in which her honour was concerned.

In the House of Commons on the same evening the Chancellor of the Exchequer, having laid certain papers on the table of the House, proceeded to explain the state of the negotiations respecting the affairs of Italy. Her Majesty's Government, he observed, had from the beginning instructed

the Queen's Ministers at Paris and Vienna to take every practicable opportunity to remove the misunderstanding between the two Courts, and, taking advantage of the favourable position of this country, the Government had interposed their good offices directly to secure the continuance of the general peace. Several causes had contributed to the misunderstanding; but the paramount cause was to be found in the unsatisfactory condition of Italy. The Government instructed Lord Cowley to take all possible means of ascertaining the views of the Emperor of the French, and to make known the views of Her Majesty's Government, which were those which had always been stated in that and the other House of Parliament by the most eminent statesmen of all parties—namely, that it would be unwise to disturb existing treaties and the balance of power established in 1815. Lord Cowley, having been requested to repair to London, was despatched to Vienna to ascertain how far Austria would meet the views of the Emperor of the French,—a mission cordially approved by the Emperor,—and that mission was entirely successful as a mission of conciliation. But before Lord Cowley could return to Paris the Court of St. Petersburg had proposed to that of France that the matters in dispute should be referred to a Congress. This proposal was accepted by the Emperor of the French, and Her Majesty's Government thought it would be wise to assent to this appeal to a Congress, and notified their willingness on four conditions, and subject to a general condition, that the Congress

should not interfere with the settlement of 1815. The four conditions were accepted by France, Russia, and Prussia, and likewise by Austria, who added a fifth condition,—the disarmament of Sardinia. When this proposition was communicated to Her Majesty's Government they did not approve it; they did not wish to sanction a course that would humiliate or weaken Sardinia, and ultimately Austria consented to waive this invidious condition, and proposed a general disarmament. France accepted this proposal of Austria, but Sardinia had not yet assented to the proposition of a general disarmament, because she had not been invited to be present at the Congress. Her Majesty's Government were prepared to put the most generous interpretation upon her conduct, and to consider the proposal of Sardinia to be present at the Congress favourably. But she was not one of the great Powers, and, if Sardinia was present, other Italian States would have a title to appear, and precedents might be pleaded for their admission. We were, therefore, in this condition—France and Austria had accepted the principle of disarmament; Sardinia had not agreed, on account of her exclusion from the Congress; but he should hope that this difficulty might be got over, and he had the satisfaction of stating that the Marquis D'Azeglio had arrived in this country on a special mission, and he expected the best results from the agency of a man of his temperate character and enlightened mind. Under these circumstances, he did not believe there was a Power in Europe that would wantonly provoke a war, and there

was a strong power in public opinion. An Italian war would probably be an European war; and if the war should spread beyond Italy, England might be interested not only in the cause of civilization, but on Imperial considerations of the most urgent character. He trusted, however, that with firmness and conciliation the peace of the world might be preserved.

Lord Palmerston said, he believed Her Majesty's Government had acted from a sense of duty in engaging in these informal negotiations, though he thought that, had they been of a more formal character, they might have had a more successful issue. It was natural that Austria should wish that the negotiations at the Congress should have been preceded or accompanied by a general disarmament; but it was an unreasonable condition that Sardinia alone should disarm, and he thought Her Majesty's Government were right in objecting to it. He was glad to hear that France and Austria had agreed to the principle of a general disarmament; but it appeared to him that the going into a long discussion as to this point, instead of discussing in Congress the real questions at issue, would be a waste of time. Why should not the Congress meet at once and settle the material points in dispute, instead of discussing the vague question of a general [disarmament? This would require a long space of time, and if its adjustment was to be preliminary to the negotiations, they would be postponed indefinitely. The Congress might meet at once and discuss and settle the real questions upon which the peace of

Europe depended. Let France and Austria withdraw their troops from Central Italy, and pledge themselves that under no circumstances, at any future time, should they return; the Congress then might, if it pleased, go into the question of the amelioration of Italy in general. But the withdrawal of the foreign troops would lay a foundation for reforms in the States south of the Po. The present difference arose from the indisposition of Sardinia to disarm unless admitted to the Congress. As the force of Sardinia was so much less than that of Austria, the latter need not be alarmed, and England and France might set her at ease in this respect. No doubt, it might be said that Sardinia was not one of the great leading Powers of Europe; but she was a member of the Conference at Paris, and she might be said to stand in an analogous position now. She was also one of the parties called upon to disarm, and if that question was to be discussed in the Congress she might say she had a right to be there and be a party to the discussion. He trusted that no Government would be so blind to its duties to itself, to its subjects, to Europe, and to mankind, as to enter into a war without necessity, which would be not merely a fault, but a crime.

Mr. T. Duncombe said that the state of Italy was a disgrace to civilized Europe, and he wanted to know what hope there was for that country in these negotiations. He insisted that Sardinia ought to be represented at the Congress: the reasons of Count Cavour were, in his opinion, unanswerable; yet the five great Powers tyrannically said she should not be present to

plead the cause of Italy. In his opinion Italy must be rid of Austria before the peace and happiness of her people could be secured.

Mr. Gladstone expressed his regret at the remarks of Mr. Duncombe, which, in his opinion, tended to widen inconveniently the field of discussion. Until he was aware that the policy of Her Majesty's Government had taken a wrong turn, he should be doing an injury by adopting a tone of accusation. There were, however, two observations which fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon which he was unwilling to put the construction they would bear. He had said that the conduct of Austria throughout these complications had been marked by a spirit of dignified conciliation, and that that of Sardinia had been perplexing and ambiguous. He questioned the justice of both these observations. He did not think that the refusal of Sardinia to disarm justified this accusatory expression.

Lord J. Russell said, but for a remark of Mr. Duncombe he should not have taken part in this discussion, because, first, he concurred in all that had fallen from Lord Palmerston; and, secondly, he felt deeply the responsibility attaching to everything which was said in that House, and feared he might drop a word that might impair the prospects of peace. As to the admission of Sardinia to the Congress, though the Government might be embarrassed by the proposal of Russia, acceded to by the Emperor of the French, he thought it would be conducive to the interests of peace to admit Sardinia

to the Congress. As to the real points in dispute, the House had no certain knowledge of the demands of the different Powers and what were the real causes of the disagreement. As Her Majesty's Government had not communicated them to the House, it would not be prudent to speculate upon them. He could only say that, at all events, he hoped they would enter into no engagements burdensome to the people of this country without the knowledge of Parliament.

After some further remarks from Sir John Walsh, Sir H. Willoughby, and other Members, the discussion terminated.

The financial arrangements for the Session being completed, and the various measures which it was intended to pass by the existing House of Commons having gone through their several stages, it remained only to take the final steps for bringing the expiring Parliament to a close. On the 19th April the prorogation took place by Commission, when, the Royal Assent having been given to a number of Bills, the Lord Chancellor delivered on Her Majesty's behalf the following speech:—

" My Lords and Gentlemen,

" We are commanded by Her Majesty to inform you that it is Her Majesty's intention forthwith to dissolve the present Parliament, with a view to enable her people to express, in the mode prescribed by the Constitution, their opinion on the state of public affairs.

" Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

" We are commanded by Her

Majesty to thank you for the wise liberality with which you have granted the necessary supplies for the military and naval defences of the country; and for the provision which you have made for the exigencies of the other branches of the public service during the interval which must elapse before the Estimates for the year can be considered by the new Parliament, which Her Majesty will direct to be immediately called.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"Her Majesty commands us to inform you that the appeal which she is about to make to her people has been rendered necessary by the difficulties experienced in carrying on the public business of the country, as indicated by the fact, that within little

more than a year two successive Administrations have failed to retain the confidence of the House of Commons; and Her Majesty prays that, under the blessing of Divine Providence, the step which she is about to take may have the effect of facilitating the discharge of her high functions, and of enabling her to conduct the Government of the country under the advice of a Ministry possessed of the confidence of her Parliament and her people."

The Lord Chancellor then declared the Parliament to be prorogued until the 5th of May. On the 23rd April, however, the official notice by which the Parliament was dissolved appeared in the Gazette, and the new writs were on the same evening sent out to the various constituencies.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NEW PARLIAMENT meets on the 31st May—Mr. Evelyn Denison is unanimously re-elected Speaker—The Business of the Session commences with the delivery of the Royal Speech, on the 7th of June, by the Queen in person—Her Majesty's Speech—The Address is moved in the House of Lords by Earl Powys; seconded by Lord Lifford—Earl Granville comments with great force on the conduct and policy of the Government—Speeches of the Earls of Malmesbury, Carlisle, and Eglinton, the Marquis of Normanby, Lords Howden and Brougham, the Earl of Ellenborough, Duke of Argyll, and Earl of Derby—The Address is agreed to nem. con.—In the House of Commons a Debate of three nights takes place—On the Address moved by Mr. A. Egerton, and seconded by Sir James Elphinstone, an Amendment is proposed by the Marquis of Hartington—The Debate turns on the Conduct of the Ministry, and is regarded as a Trial of Strength—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount Bury, Sir Charles Napier, Viscount Palmerston, Mr. Sergeant Deasy, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Mr. Bright, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Ker Seymer, Sir James Graham, Mr. White-side, Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Bentinck, the Solicitor-General, Sir George Lewis, Sir John Pakington, Lord John Russell, Mr. Roebuck, and other Members—On a division the Ministers are placed in a minority of 13—Their Defeat is followed by the Resignation of the Earl of Derby's Cabinet—Statement of Lord Derby in the House of Lords, and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons—An Administration is formed under Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister—Both Houses are adjourned for some days to fix time for the re-elections of Ministers to the vacated seats—Earl Granville, on the 30th June, states in the House of Lords what had passed in regard to the Ministerial Arrangements, and the Principles which would actuate the new Government—Remarks of Lord Brougham, the Duke of Rutland, the Earl of Malmesbury, the Duke of Newcastle, and Lord Howden—Lord Palmerston makes a similar communication to the House of Commons—STATE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCES AND APPREHENSIONS OF INVASION—Sir Charles Napier calls attention to the Deficiencies of the Navy—The Earl of Ripon, as Under-Secretary for War, states the intention of the new Government with respect to Volunteer Rifle Corps—Remarks of Lord Ellenborough, Lord Howden, and Lord Brougham, the Duke of Somerset, and the Earl of Hardwicke—Explanations of Mr. Sidney Herbert in the House of Commons respecting Rifle Corps—Remarkable Speech of Lord Lyndhurst in the House

of Lords on the Danger to this Country in case of Invasion, and on the Necessity for vigorous Measures of Defence—Observations of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Earl Granville, the Earl of Hardwicke, the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Ellenborough, Lord Brougham, and the Duke of Argyll—Debate in the House of Commons on Volunteer Rifle Corps—Statements of General Peel, and Mr. Sidney Herbert—A Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Organization of the Army—THE NAVY ESTIMATES—Statement by Lord Clarence Paget, Secretary to the Admiralty, of our naval strength in the Channel—Bill to establish a Reserve Volunteer Force of Seamen discussed and carried—Important speech of Mr. Sidney Herbert on moving the Army Estimates—Debates on the Defence of the Country—Sir de Lacy Evans moves for a Commission of Inquiry—Mr. Sidney Herbert intimates that the Government had resolved to adopt a similar step, and after some Remarks from Lord Palmerston and other Members, the Motion is withdrawn—Mr. Horeman moves a Resolution for appropriating a specific Fund to complete the necessary works of National Defence—Speeches of Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir C. Napier, Mr. Cobden, Sir John Pakington, Lord Clarence Paget, and Lord Palmerston—The Motion is negatived on a Division, by 167 to 70—Lord Lyndhurst vindicates his speech on the Danger of Invasion from the Strictures of Mr. Bright—Remarks of the Duke of Somerset—Lord Stratford de Redcliffe objects to the Suspension of the Ballot for Militia in the present state of Foreign Relations—Lord Kingsdown takes the same view—Answer of Lord Ripon on the part of the Government.

ON the 31st May, the newly-elected Parliament was summoned by Royal Proclamation to meet at Westminster. On that day the Lords Commissioners having taken their seats in the House of Lords, the Members of the House of Commons were summoned in the accustomed form to the bar. The Lord Chancellor then declared to them Her Majesty's pleasure that they should, in the first instance, proceed to elect a Speaker, and present the person so chosen for Her Majesty's approbation.

Accordingly, the Members having returned to the House of Commons, and the Chief Clerk having taken his place at the table, Mr. Wilson Patten rose,

and said:—"Sir, I hope it will not be considered an act of presumption on my part if I propose to the House one of its Members to fill the office of Speaker. If any one of the political parties of which the House of Commons is composed had any intention to name a candidate for that distinguished office, I should abandon the duty I have now undertaken to perform to some Member more practised in the political discussions of the House, who would have discharged the duty with more propriety than myself. But understanding that no such intention exists on the part of any section of the House, and believing, on the contrary, that con-

siderable unanimity will be found to prevail on both sides, I do not hesitate to comply with what I believe is the general feeling. I therefore rise, sir, to propose that my right hon. friend the Member for North Nottinghamshire, Mr. Evelyn Denison, do take the chair, and again preside over us. (*Cheers.*) My right hon. friend has already performed the duties of Speaker of this House, and his general conduct in the chair will be his best recommendation for re-election. But I may, perhaps, be allowed to remind the House that when he was first elected to that distinguished post he had no common difficulties to contend with. He had to succeed a Speaker who, it was universally acknowledged, had filled the chair of this House with more than usual ability, and was one of the most eminent Speakers who had ever sat in it. It was no light task for any Member of this House to discharge the duties of the office as the successor of the present Viscount Eversley. But the manner in which my right hon. friend overcame this difficulty is well-known to the House; and I am bold to say that to the constant attention he has paid to his duties, the impartiality of his decisions, and his general bearing towards all the Members of the House, may be attributed the prevailing feeling which now exists that he should resume the chair. Sir, there are duties the Speaker of this House has to perform that may not be known to many Members of it; and though I make no pretensions to taking a principal part in the public proceedings of the House, yet, perhaps, few Members have had better

opportunities than myself of knowing how my right hon. friend has conducted its private business. I believe all those Members of the House who have had to take part in that private business, in reference to which the Speaker has duties of no common importance, will acknowledge that my right hon. friend has been distinguished by his general courtesy to every one, without distinction of party or private feeling. All have had ready access to him, and received the aid of his advice and experience. I do not wish to be betrayed into any private feeling on an occasion like this, but perhaps I may be permitted, from a knowledge of nearly 50 years, to express my conviction that, as in public, so in private, my right hon. friend is in every way worthy of the honour for which I propose him. I believe it would be difficult to find any gentleman combining so many of the characteristics required to represent the Commons of England in so great a degree as my right hon. friend. He has been distinguished throughout his life for an unimpeachable character as a private gentleman; and one of the chief recommendations of the person who aspires to the honour of representing the Commons of England as their Speaker must be the character he bears as a private gentleman. I propose that Mr. E. Denison, Member for North Nottinghamshire, be again elected as the Speaker of this House."

The motion was seconded by Sir F. Baring, who adverted to the difficulties with which Mr. Denison had had to contend, and to the success with which he had surmounted them.

[H 2]

Mr. Denison submitted himself to the pleasure of the House; and there being no dissentient voice, he was conducted by the mover and seconder to the Chair, whence he offered his acknowledgments in the customary manner to the House.

Several days were now occupied in the swearing of Members. The only incident which occurred worthy of notice was when Baron Rothschild presented himself to be sworn, and having objected to take the oath containing the words "on the true faith of a Christian," he withdrew, as directed by the Speaker.

Lord J. Russell then rose and moved the resolution which had been adopted by the House, enabling Jewish members to omit the words in the oath excepted to. This gave Mr. Newdegate an occasion for renewing his protest against the admission of the Jews.

The Speaker put the question, and Mr. Newdegate demanded a division. The House, however, did not divide, and Baron Rothschild was called in and sworn.

On the 7th of June, the process of swearing in having been completed, the business of the Session was commenced, Her Majesty in person delivering the following Speech from the Throne:—

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—

"I avail myself with satisfaction, in the present anxious state of public affairs, of the advice of my Parliament, which I have summoned to meet with the least possible delay.

"I have directed that papers shall be laid before you, from which you will learn how earnest

and unceasing have been my endeavours to preserve the peace of Europe

"Those endeavours have unhappily failed; and war has been declared between France and Sardinia on one side, and Austria on the other. Receiving assurances of friendship from both the contending parties, I intend to maintain between them a strict and impartial neutrality; and I hope, with God's assistance, to preserve to my people the blessings of continued peace.

"Considering, however, the present state of Europe, I have deemed it necessary, for the security of my dominions and the honour of my Crown, to increase my naval forces to an amount exceeding that which has been sanctioned by Parliament.

"I rely with confidence on your cordial concurrence in this precautionary measure of defensive policy.

"The King of the Two Sicilies having announced to me the death of the King, his father, and his own accession, I have thought fit, in concert with the Emperor of the French, to renew my diplomatic intercourse with the Court of Naples, which had been suspended during the late reign.

"All my other foreign relations continue on a perfectly satisfactory footing.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—

"The Estimates for the year, for which provision has not been made by the late Parliament, will be immediately laid before you, together with such supplementary Estimates as present circumstances render indispen-

sably necessary for the public service.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—

"I have directed a Bill to be prepared for giving effect, so far as the aid of Parliament may be required, to certain suggestions of the Commissioners whom I had appointed to inquire into the best mode of efficiently manning the Royal Navy; and I recommend this important subject to your immediate attention.

"Measures of legal and social improvement, the progress of which in the late Parliament was necessarily interrupted by the dissolution, will again be brought under your consideration.

"I should with pleasure give my sanction to any well-considered measure for the amendment of the laws which regulate the representation of my people in Parliament; and should you be of opinion that the necessity of giving your immediate attention to measures of urgency relating to the defence and financial condition of the country will not leave you sufficient time for legislating with due deliberation during the present Session on a subject at once so difficult and so extensive, I trust that at the commencement of the next Session your earnest attention will be given to a question of which an early and satisfactory settlement would be greatly to the public advantage.

"I feel assured that you will enter with zeal and diligence on the discharge of your Parliamentary duties, and I pray that the result of your deliberations may tend to secure to the country the continuance of peace abroad and progressive improvement at home."

The debates on the Address now commenced in both Houses, the mover in the Lords being Earl Powis. The noble lord made some allusion to the anticipated Reform Bill, which, he observed, would not be likely to come before their lordships until an inconveniently late period of the Session. Referring to our foreign relations, Lord Powis said the position of this country was one of neutrality; but in order to make its voice respected we must make preparations commensurate with our power. He was glad to see the encouragement which had been given to the formation of rifle clubs by the present Government. Bearing a willing testimony to the courtesy and forbearance which the Opposition had ever practised on foreign affairs, he concluded by moving that a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty.

The motion having been seconded by Lord Lifford, Earl Granville rose and delivered some spirited criticisms on the policy and position of the Government.

Alluding to a passage in the Speech dissolving Parliament, he considered that the Government had not relied on Providence alone to procure a majority, but had themselves put their shoulder to the wheel. He regretted, however, to see that, in spite of the result of the elections, it was the intention of the Ministry to carry on the Government with a minority. One of the principal errors, he thought, of the Conservative party was that it endeavoured to please everybody. This system, he was sorry to observe, was not to be abandoned, for Her Majesty's Government had asserted that they had no opinion

at all on the Reform question, but would be obliged for the guidance of the House of Commons. Passing to the suspicions which had been incurred by the Government during the Irish elections, he thought it would have been better to make concessions to the Roman Catholics at a time when no political movements were going forward. He condemned the policy of the Government in delaying to bring forward their financial statement—a delay productive of increased expenditure. It gave him much pleasure to hear that our foreign relations were in a favourable condition; but he could not help regretting that no effort had been made to induce Russia to co-operate with us to preserve the peace of Europe—that peace had been violated by a great, a disastrous, and an unnecessary war, from which it was impossible to foresee any good result. The question was, Had everything been done by the Government to avert war? As far as zeal and good wishes went he doubted not that everything had been done; but he could not yet say whether the necessary skill, ability, and determination which would have averted war had been shown. At present there was so little information on the subject that no decided opinion could be formed on it. He was glad to observe that it was the intention of the Ministry to maintain our neutrality, but he did not wish it to be understood that our neutrality would be maintained under any circumstances, as it would only encourage the belligerent Powers to disregard any remonstrances we might address to them. He could hardly conceive

any cause which would justify this country in plunging into this war. The subject, however, required greater skill and greater firmness than Her Majesty's Government had yet shown. It was not his intention to move any amendment to the Address. The Government had appealed to the country, and the result of that appeal would be declared in the other House. If the vote of the House of Commons was favourable to the Ministry, he said most distinctly for himself and friends, that, although they should not abstain from watching the course of public affairs, they would abstain from anything like factious opposition. If the vote should be unsatisfactory to the Government, he could only express his hope that it would be satisfactory to the country.

Lord Malmesbury stated his intention of laying before the House the whole of the correspondence relating to the war and to the efforts which had been made by the Government to secure peace. He would not, in the absence of papers, go further into this matter, and referred Lord Granville to the Italian papers of 1848, requesting him to compare them with those of 1859, when he should, he thought, have no reason to fear the attacks which his political opponents might make upon him.

Lord Howden, after an eloquent sketch of French policy in Italy, stated it as his opinion that if France established herself in Italy this country would be ultimately drawn into the war. He asked the Government whether they were ready to repeat the denial that no secret treaty or understanding existed

now between France and Russia. He had reason to believe that some agreement had been concluded between those two Powers within the last three weeks.

Lord Normanby objected to the line of policy pursued by his own party. Thinking that the Government had been deceived in the late negotiations, he unveiled the intrigues of Sardinia and France, and especially of Russia, in extending her influence in the Mediterranean Sea. It was one of the objects of the treaty of Tilsit, he said, to reject from that sea all those whose territories did not abut on it, and it was the duty of this country to be prepared for any such attempt. Condemning the sympathy which Lord Palmerston had expressed for the Italians, he gave a very lengthy statement of the progress of events in Parma, Tuscany, and Modena since the beginning of the year, and concluded by exhorting the Government to resist any attempt at universal domination.

The Earl of Carlisle was glad to observe the unanimous desire among the leading statesmen to adhere strictly to neutrality. He drew the attention of the House to the strange coalition which had taken place between the Roman Catholics and the Conservative party at the late elections.

The Earl of Eglinton gave a denial to the reports of the newspapers relating to a supposed compact between himself and Cardinal Wiseman. In the most unequivocal manner he denied that any understanding either before, during, or after the elections had been come to between the Roman Catholics and the Irish Government.

Lord Brougham thought that hostilities had been begun without a shadow of pretence, except the false pretence of favouring the cause of liberty. The origin of this war was due to Sardinia. It was an old maxim of a Roman judge, when he could not discover the author of a crime to ask the question *cui bono?* For whose profit? and he wished to apply this test to the present war—Who gains by it? No one was more eager than himself to see the Austrians driven from Italy; but merely to hand the Italians over from one master to another,—such a course, guaranteed as these provinces were to Austria by treaty, would be nothing but plunder. To disregard such a right to possessions would be contrary to the soundest principles of international law. If Lombardy, however, could be erected into an independent kingdom it would be a positive benefit to Austria by the relief it would afford to her finances. We had no reason, he thought, to distrust the Emperor of the French; yet, considering his position, we ought to be, not mistrustful, but on our guard. To increase our navy, to establish and stimulate the enrolling of volunteer rifle corps in every part of the country, would be the best means of gaining that object.

Lord Ellenborough cordially concurred with Lord Brougham, and said, that what was wanted in the present crisis was a strong Government. He expressed his conviction that this result had not been gained by the dissolution, and wished that the House of Commons would imitate the example of Mr. Fox, who, in 1804, had relinquished his opposition to

Mr. Pitt, when the emergencies of the time required such a sacrifice.

The Duke of Argyll agreed that, in the present condition of affairs, a strong Government was imperatively necessary. He argued from the various measures (which he reviewed in detail) of the present Government that they were not capable of conducting the affairs of the country.

Lord Derby said that although the debate had been important, it had been of a highly discursive character, for he had not heard any reference to any paragraph in the Royal Speech. He had heard much nonsense talked of, the efforts made by the Government to influence the late elections. In regard to Ireland they had heard the denial of Lord Eglinton, and he for himself denied as strongly that any compact existed between him and Cardinal Wiseman. Proceeding to certain charges made against the Government by Sir James Graham, he showed that the increase of the billeting-money was in accordance with the recommendation of a Parliamentary Committee at the beginning of the year, and that the provision relating to it was introduced into the Mutiny Bill long before any idea was entertained of a dissolution of Parliament. If he could see any chance of a strong Government he would gladly lay down the responsibility he had assumed; but, considering the state of foreign affairs, he thought it was his duty to his Sovereign still to remain at his post. He had accepted office with the intention of appealing to the country in case of a defeat in the House of Commons. He denied

the analogy which had been drawn between the prorogations of 1841 and 1859; and, although he must admit the present Government were in a minority, at the same time he was convinced that no Government could be formed so strong and united as the one in office. In admitting the forbearance which had been exercised in foreign affairs by the Opposition, he thought their abstinence on other subjects had been as much due to their discretion as to their justice or moderation. The dissolution was not to discover whether the country approved the Reform Bill, but whether it approved the mode of proceeding adopted by its opponents. Whatever our feelings on the present struggle in Italy might be, we were bound by treaties not to give way to them. He thought this war had been undertaken on false pretences, at the instance of Sardinia, but neither on one side nor the other was there any ground for quarrel which might not have been arranged by diplomacy. It was for this country to maintain a strict neutrality between all parties. But the position of a neutral was most delicate and difficult, and it would be madness in a statesman, however sincerely desirous of neutrality, not adequately to provide for the defence of the country, as the only neutrality to be respected must be an armed neutrality. He entertained no fear of any proximate invasion, but when he saw the increasing armaments of other nations it became the duty of the Government to place the navy of the country on a strong footing. In the present state of things he believed no demand for the defence of the kingdom would be

refused by the House of Commons. If it should be proved that Her Majesty's Government did not possess the confidence of the country, and that another party did, he could only say that he should lay down with greater pleasure than he had taken up, the responsibility of office. Should, however, as he expected, a contrary decision be arrived at, he hailed with pleasure the promise of Lord Granville that no factious opposition would be offered to the Government of the country.

The Address was then agreed to by their lordships *nem. con.*

In the House of Commons, however, the Debate on the Address took a very different turn, it having been determined by the Liberal party to bring the Government to a trial of strength by moving an amendment. The debate was consequently protracted to three nights, and the whole course of ministerial policy, both domestic and foreign, underwent a thorough discussion.

The mover of the Address was Mr. A. Egerton, who, after briefly considering the views and interests of the several States engaged in the war then raging in Italy, hailed the policy of strict neutrality enunciated in Her Majesty's Speech, commending, at the same time, the course taken by the Government in strengthening the maritime force of the country. With reference to the threatened amendment, he observed that it must be meant as an attack upon the past or the future policy of the present Administration, and he contended that they had not forfeited by the one a title to confidence in the other.

Sir James Elphinstone seconded the Address, devoting a considerable part of his speech to the subject of our naval defences, which he strongly urged the necessity of maintaining and of adopting improvements in all the departments connected with it.

The Marquis of Hartington then rose to move an amendment to the Address, expressing a want of confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers, justifying this course by the precedent of 1841, and upon the ground that this question was the real issue which they had put to the country. If this motion was successful, it could not, he observed, be otherwise than satisfactory to Ministers to be relieved from a position which they could not desire to occupy. He subjected to a severe criticism the principal measures, some of them abortive, proposed by the present Government, and especially condemned the manner in which they had received the sentence of the House upon their Reform Bill, by dissolving the Parliament at a crisis when its advice was so much needed, which he characterized as an act of rashness and recklessness. With regard to their foreign policy, he thought it was impossible not to infer from its results that there had been mismanagement in it. He might be told, he said, that this amendment was a party move: he admitted it; but it was not a party move for the political aggrandizement of any individuals. He wished to see power in the hands of the Liberal party, whose differences, he observed, were not of principle, but only of detail, rather than in those of a party antagonistic to all progress. He concluded by reading the

terms of his amendment, which represented to Her Majesty that the confidence of the House was not reposed in Her Majesty's present advisers.

The amendment was seconded by Mr. Hanbury.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he found no fault with the course taken by Lord Hartington and his friends, which was a convenient one; but he denied that there was any analogy between the present case and that of 1841. It was of great advantage that it should be known whether the advisers of the Crown possessed the confidence of the House. It was desirable that this question should be decided without delay, and he hoped the House would be able to divide that night. He proceeded to discuss the grounds assigned for the vote of want of confidence. He insisted that the failure of the Government measures in the last Parliament was not a fair ground upon which to rest such a vote in the present. He justified the dissolution, and congratulated Lord Hartington upon his having abstained from repeating certain trash which, he said, had, during the recess, been the subject of charges against the Government out of doors. Upon this head Mr. Disraeli spoke in terms of severe reprehension of the allegations made by Sir J. Graham at Carlisle, to which he gave an indignant denial. The supposed compact with the Roman Catholics he utterly repudiated. The manner in which our foreign negotiations had been conducted was another ground for the vote of want of confidence; but he contended that it was neither just nor conformable to the

practice of the House to decide this question in the absence of the necessary documents. The last ground for the vote was the failure of the measure of Reform proposed by the Government; and their insufficiency to deal with the question of Parliamentary Reform. He compared that measure with the preceding Bill upon this subject introduced by Lord J. Russell, and asked why the present Ministers should be less qualified to deal with it than that noble lord, whose Bill exhibited so many shortcomings, or than Lord Palmerston, who had shrunk from it altogether. Adverting to the two main topics in the Royal Speech, he said, with respect to the first, that Government had endeavoured by all the means in their power to preserve peace, and he was ready to vindicate them on this head. He retained the opinion he had formerly expressed, that the vote at which the House had arrived upon Lord J. Russell's Resolution had a serious influence upon the negotiations; but still the representations of the Government, backed by public opinion, had been listened to with respect; they had since adopted the principle of a strict and impartial neutrality, and endeavoured to act in the spirit of that principle. With regard to the other subject, that of Parliamentary Reform, he said at once that it was the opinion of the Government that that great question could not be satisfactorily dealt with during this Session. If that was a fair ground for a censure of the Government, they were ready to meet the issue. At the same time they did not desire to shrink from the responsibility of dealing with this ques-

tion, which ought not to be monopolized by any person or party. He reviewed some of the elements of this question, maintaining that the present Government were perfectly free to deal with it without being bound or hampered by their proposition in the last Parliament. Treating the question raised by the amendment as really one of personal sufficiency, which he admitted was a fair ground for a vote of want of confidence, he met it upon that ground, and he skilfully seized the opportunity of indulging his vein of sarcasm upon the personal claims of some of those who expected to succeed the present Government. He acknowledged that the area of selection for the public service was limited; but the Conservative party was not a federation of great families, and he hoped that the House would not hastily adopt an amendment which came from a limited and an exclusive party.

Lord Bury, in supporting the amendment, observed that Her Majesty's Ministers had by the dissolution of Parliament directly raised the issue of confidence or no confidence in the Administration of Lord Derby, and it was from no factious or improper motive that the earliest opportunity was taken to determine this issue. In the present state of affairs, he was not disposed to intrust the conduct of our foreign negotiations to the present Government, the sincerity of whose professions of neutrality he distrusted, and who, in his opinion, had shown a partiality towards Austria.

Mr. Mellor and Mr. Knatchbull Hugessen supported the amendment, and condemned the policy of the dissolution.

Sir C. Napier said he did not

rise to speak for or against the amendment, but upon the defence of the country. He gave the present Government credit for putting the Navy into a better condition than that in which it had been left by their predecessors, but he insisted that it ought to have been got into a still better state, and he called upon the First Lord of the Admiralty to give certain explanations upon the subject.

Mr. Wilson spoke in support of the amendment, resting his vote not on the mere question of the dissolution, of which he complained, not only upon English, but upon European grounds; he rested it, he said, likewise upon the management of the various departments of the Government, and upon matters clearly connected with the administration of the Government. He proceeded to show what he believed to be the insecure state of the public finances, the vicious administration of those finances, and, lastly, the errors in the foreign policy of the Government. Upon the financial points, he entered into various details relating to income and expenditure, contending that, while the former had fallen short of the estimates, the latter had exceeded them; and he attacked the policy of the Government in relation to the transmarine postal contracts and arrangements. He reviewed minutely their conduct in relation to the foreign negotiations, which, he contended, was not calculated to preserve the peace of Europe; and with regard to the question of neutrality, expressions had been used, he remarked, in the other House by Lord Derby, which raised a suspicion of the sincerity of Ministers upon that point.

Mr. Digby Seymour opposed the amendment as a party movement. Mr. Laing took the opposite side, condemning the foreign policy of the Government.

Lord Palmerston, referring to the silence of the opposite party, asked how the House could place confidence in those who had no confidence in themselves? It was a most extraordinary spectacle, he observed, that a Government charged in the face of the House with being unworthy of the confidence of Parliament and the country should sit silent under such a charge. Upon every ground—their mistakes in domestic legislation, the errors in their foreign policy, and the course they had pursued in regard to the dissolution—upon all these grounds the House, in his opinion, was justified in withholding its confidence from the Government. He dwelt upon their failures in domestic legislation, contending that they justified the House in refusing to place confidence in them upon that ground, as well as upon the ground of their dissolution of Parliament, which deprived the country of the benefit of its advice in a great crisis. Having shown themselves unequal to deal with domestic affairs, the Government had evinced much more their incompetency to manage our foreign relations, the course they had pursued having, in his opinion brought on war. They had manifested an ignorance of the real state of affairs, having believed that the danger of war was imminent on the part of France and Sardinia, and not on that of Austria, whereas the reverse was the fact; otherwise they would have held a different language to Austria,

which might have prevented hostilities. The Government, therefore, were not entitled to the confidence of the House in regard to our foreign relations; and in inviting the House to express this want of confidence in such a Government, which existed only upon sufferance, the Liberal party had pursued a straightforward course, and they would have shrunk from their duty had they refused to take it.

Mr. Serjeant Deasy, in supporting the amendment, complained of the constitution and conduct of the Executive authority in Ireland and of the exercise of the Government and other patronage there, which had been regarded, he said, with jealousy and distrust by the bulk of the Irish people. It was for Imperial interests that this jealousy and distrust should, at this crisis especially, be removed or mitigated; and this, in his opinion, could not be done while the present Government ruled in Ireland. There were three grounds upon which, he thought, the vote of want of confidence in the Government could be maintained and justified: first, their political antecedents before they came into power; secondly, their legislative measures, and the inefficiency of their domestic administration; and thirdly, their foreign policy. Upon all these grounds, each of which he discussed in succession, he denied the title of the present Ministry to the confidence of the House, and he believed that their removal would give place to a strong and Liberal administration, respected both abroad and at home.

Mr. S. Fitzgerald addressed

himself to the two grounds upon which, he said, Lord Palmerston had justified his refusal of confidence to the Government,—namely, their failures in domestic administration, and their ill-success in the management of our foreign relations. With respect to the former, he reminded the House of the difficult circumstances under which Lord Derby had assumed the Government, and suggested that, considering the discordant elements of which the Opposition was composed, the House should be assured, if the present Ministry were removed from office, upon what principles the Government would be conducted,—whether the schemes of Mr. Bright were to be carried out or not. The objection to the foreign policy of Ministers was founded, he observed, upon two grounds,—that it had not prevented war; and that they were not sincere in their profession of neutrality, but were inspired by Austrian sympathies. He contended, that it was altogether premature to argue the first in the absence of the official papers, and he emphatically denied that there was a shadow of foundation for the other allegation. In vindicating the Government upon the latter head, he animadverted with some severity upon some incidents in the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston, and read an extract from a speech of Mr. Milner Gibson, bitterly censuring that policy. He did not believe, he said, that the House of Commons would, by a vote of want of confidence in the present Government, restore to power a party, of which one of the leading members was a noble lord, whose character had been thus described by one of

the opponents of the present Government.

Mr. Bright said he was not about to defend Lord Palmerston, and had no facts to convince him that the Government had not done all in their power to prevent the war now raging in Italy; but, as to the neutrality to which the Government had pledged themselves, he wanted to know whether it was real or pretended. The question applied almost entirely to France. The increase of our naval force in the Mediterranean, the high bounties offered for enlistment in the navy, and the formation of rifle corps, were not directed against Austria; and was it not likely, or even inevitable, that these preparations would destroy in the minds of the French Government and people all confidence in our professions of neutrality? There was no reason to distrust the Emperor of the French; there was no increased cause of suspicion; yet in Germany the general opinion was that the Government of England was disposed rather to side with Austria than with France. He was not disposed to blame the present Ministers for all this; but he could not confide in a Government whose neutrality, so far as he had any explanation of it, was to be found in continued and gigantic preparations for war. He did not doubt that from the next Government there would be the same professions of neutrality; but, with regard to France, all classes of the people would feel that there would be somewhat more of sympathy towards France on the part of their successors than, as far as he knew, was entertained by the present Go-

vernment. He was not, however, one of those who approved the personal alliance between France and England, which, in his opinion, did not add to the dignity or to the advantage of either nation; he should prefer a generous and dignified conduct on the part of both Governments to an alliance that seemed to separate them from other nations. On the subject of Parliamentary Reform, after a strong condemnation of the late Bill, Mr. Bright insisted that there was still sufficient time in the present Session to bring forward another measure; but, besides this question and that of our foreign policy, there were other reasons why the present Government had not the confidence of the House. He believed that with a new Government there would be a more friendly feeling with France, and that there would be laid upon the table a measure of reform which it would be the duty of the House and the people to accept. But his support of any Government would depend upon their measures and their policy.

Lord Ashley spoke in favour of the amendment. Mr. Palk supported the original motion, enlarging on the evils attendant on frequent changes of Government. Mr. Baxter, with some reluctance, declared he should vote for the amendment, on account of the legislative failures of the Government, their objectionable foreign policy, and their having rashly dissolved Parliament. Mr. Liddell thought the present Ministers had fulfilled their pledges, and was opposed to a change. Mr. Gurney, though sitting on the Liberal side, defended the Government. He saw no reason

why they should not pass a suitable Reform Bill. He thought they had honestly endeavoured to observe neutrality abroad. Their efforts to put the country in a state of defence did not imply hostility to France. Mr. F. Crossley supported the amendment. He was unwilling to trust the question of Reform to those, who had always opposed it. Mr. Spooner supported the Ministers.

Mr. Horsman observed that, as the Government of this country by a minority in that House was anomalous, unconstitutional, and too dangerous to be permitted to continue, it was the first duty of the new Parliament to bring the question of confidence to a speedy decision, and it behoved them to decide it upon safe public grounds. After the announcement in the Queen's Speech relating to the war, the House was bound to inquire and satisfy itself what part this country had borne in the late negotiations; whether the Ministers of England had, in grave complications, exhibited capacity, energy, foresight, and impartiality. For this object it was absolutely essential that the House should have the fullest information before it, and this inquiry might have been deferred until the papers had been produced. But the Ministers had abandoned this ground, and consented to put the question upon a more limited issue. He could not, therefore, vote against the amendment.

Mr. K. Seymer defended the Government, observing that the failure of their measures was not their fault; that it was owing to the unfair and obstructive manner in which they had been treated by the Liberal party. He gave

a history of the intestine discords of that party, which was now said to be united; but he doubted the sincerity of this union, specifying various questions which pressed for decision, and upon which there was a declared antagonism in the different sections of the party, especially that of Reform. He disputed the opinions of Lord Palmerston as to the foreign policy of the Government, declaring that he had no sympathy with Austria; he did sympathize with Italy, but not with France and Italy fighting against Austria.

Sir J. Graham observed that the question before the House was—Should the present Government be in possession of power with the consent of the majority? To that issue he should endeavour to confine his observations. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, having thought fit, he said, to indulge in personal remarks upon him, he addressed himself, in the first place, to that matter, and entered into details relating to various allegations which he had made at Carlisle against the Government, to which Mr. Disraeli had referred in his speech. Sir James complained of the offensive terms in which Mr. Disraeli had conveyed his contradictions. He then proceeded to vindicate himself against the effect of Mr. Seymour's remarks upon the dissensions among the Liberal party; and, after slightly touching upon foreign affairs, and approving the policy of the Government in arming the people of this country, he expressed a strong condemnation of the late dissolution, pointing out the manner in which it had risked the national interests.

Measures of vast importance, forestalling the decision of Parliament upon questions of the gravest kind, had been, he observed, adopted by the Government, during the interval, upon their own responsibility with reference to the navy and the army. The course pursued by the Government upon the subject of Reform rendered it impossible for him, he said, to give them his support, and without hesitation he should vote for the amendment.

Mr. Whiteside admitted the principles of foreign policy contended for by Lord Hartington; which were those of Mr. Fox; he only disputed their application. He discussed the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston in 1848, a summary of which, in condemnatory terms, he read in the words of Sir J. Graham, and contended, that it was in the teeth of the principles of Mr. Fox. Those principles of non-intervention were right, and they had been violated by Lord Palmerston in almost every instance. Such being his policy, the Government should not be changed upon that ground. Mr. Whiteside then went over the charges against the Government brought by Sir J. Graham at Carlisle, denouncing them, particularly that relating to the Galway contract, as destitute of the slightest foundation. The charge of a compact with the Catholics—who were always virtuous, he observed, when they voted with the Whigs—he attributed to the jealousy and mortification of that party at the alteration in the sentiments of the people of Ireland. He denied for himself and the other members of the Irish Government that there had been any compact with the Roman

Catholic party for the purpose of obtaining votes, and he asked whether it was worthy of Sir J. Graham to try to raise against the Government a religious cry in Ireland. Mr. Whiteside amused the House by reading, in conclusion, the characters which some of the Liberal leaders had given of each other, congratulating it upon the Ministry in prospect.

Mr. M. Gibson said that the present question was forced upon the House by the course taken by the Executive Government in dissolving Parliament on a pure question of political confidence in the advisers of the Crown. He felt, therefore, that he was not an attacking party, but that he only answered a challenge thrown down by the Government. The House had been told that the dissolution was a necessity, because the Government could not carry their measures. Its object, therefore, was to increase the Conservative element in the House, so as to carry measures of a more Conservative character, and, as far as possible, to extinguish the Liberal party. How, then, could Liberals vote confidence in a party who so acted? After some strictures upon the exercise of Government influence at elections generally, and drawing attention to circumstances connected with the last election for Berwick, which, he thought, called for explanation, he avowed his distrust of the vague professions of the Government on the subject of Reform. He could not vote confidence in them, he said, on that ground, nor upon that of religious equality and freedom of conscience. On the important question of neutrality, he did not charge the Govern-

ment with a direct desire to support by patent acts either side in the war now going on; but he was of opinion that they had, at least, Austrian sympathies, and the question was whether, in such circumstances, there could be an honest neutrality on their part. He should wait for the promised papers before he determined whether the Government were neutral or not, though experience told him that such documents were not always to be relied upon. He did not charge the Government with not having prevented the war, which had arisen from the necessities of the position, from the unfortunate state in which the Italian subjects of Austria had been left. Believing that he should best promote the cause of Reform by voting for the amendment, he should give it his hearty support.

Mr. Lindsay said he felt, as an advocate for Reform, that he should best perform his duty to his Liberal constituents by voting against the amendment. The present Government had pledged themselves to a substantial measure of Reform, which he thought more likely to pass by the instrumentality of the party now in power than by that of Lord J. Russell. The Liberal party, having concurred in destroying the late Government, ought to see whether the Cabinet they now proposed to substitute for the present was likely to be stronger; and he insisted upon the conflict between the views of the different sections of the Liberal ranks upon various grave questions of policy.

Mr. Sidney Herbert delivered, perhaps, the most effective speech that was made against the Go-

vernment. He considered that the dissolution was war to the knife against the Liberal party, who had a perfect right to take up the challenge. If the Government were beaten, they must of course bow to the decision of the House. With regard to the measures of the Government, he said, that first they offered the House a measure which was compatible with their principles, —now they were disposed to offer a measure which was incompatible with their principles. They were general merchants, who had samples of every kind. He preferred to see the Reform question in the hands of Reformers, to waiting for the fulfilment of the promises which the Government had made. He remarked, that when he was in office he succeeded in affording the means of spiritual instruction to the Roman Catholics at the seat of war, but was violently resisted by the Conservative party. A change, however, had now come over them, and they acknowledged the principle, although he quite admitted that no treaty or compact upon that subject had been signed. He said to those on the opposite benches, who were changing their opinions on this and other subjects, that he had not confidence that the promises they made would be carried out, and if he could get the same measures from men who could introduce them without any sacrifice of principle, he would endeavour to make a change that would secure so great an object. He condemned the practice of raking up bits of *Hansard*, in order to found charges of inconsistency against public men, but thought that a few of such charges

VOL. CL.

might be retorted upon the other side. On the subject of foreign affairs, he said, he did not bring any charge against Lord Malmesbury of having caused the war; his refusal of confidence was founded upon home transactions. He thought Lord Malmesbury had done his best in difficult circumstances, and that he had been treated with great injustice, especially by his friends. Referring to the state of parties, he saw no prospect, he said, of any Government that would not be weak in point of supporters; the justification of his vote for the amendment would be that they might have one stronger in point of composition. It was a choice of difficulties, and, if he were beaten, he should cheerfully acquiesce in the decision.

Mr. Bentinck opposed the amendment. He thought that any new Government, to be formed out of the opposite party, would be as weak as the present, and the House did not know what their policy would be—whether the principles of Mr. Bright or of Lord Palmerston would be in the ascendant.

Mr. Danby Seymour replied to Mr. Fitzgerald's charges against the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston, which had been strictly neutral, but he thought there was some cause of impotency to the present Ministers—a leaning towards Austria, the effect of which was injurious to Italy.

Captain Vernon characterized the amendment as a desperate attempt on the part of gentlemen out of office to return to the Treasury. Who, he asked, were to be their leaders? What was their bond of union? Peace?

[1]

That was not the vocation of Lord Palmerston. War? That would be against the feeling of Mr. Bright. Lord J. Russell, he admitted, had a bias both ways. Upon the question of Reform no power on earth would induce Lord Palmerston to go the whole length of Mr. Bright, or prevail upon the latter to stop with Lord Palmerston. Here, again, Lord J. Russell had a bias towards both.

Mr. Leatham said he should vote against the Government, though with considerable reluctance.

Sir G. Lewis fully admitted that the amendment was one of an unusual and extraordinary nature; but it had been forced on the Opposition by the conduct of the Government. The Resolution of Lord J. Russell did not involve a censure upon them; they had appealed to the country for a vote of confidence in themselves as an Administration, and the question put to the constituency did not turn upon the Reform Bill; it was that of confidence or no confidence in Her Majesty's advisers. The challenge was given and accepted, and the issue fairly before the House was the fate of the Administration. He admitted that this motion was a party move; but all great questions in that House had been decided by party moves. He reviewed the domestic policy of the Government, and observed that all the financial calculations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been falsified.

Sir J. Pakington remarked that the fault of the Government was that their places were wanted by the other side; that was the real question, and those who

raised it had a right to do so. After justifying himself in a personal matter referred to by Mr. S. Herbert, he proceeded to discuss the charges made against the Ministers, that they had failed in their legislation and in their foreign policy. He asked upon what part of their foreign policy a vote of no confidence could be founded. There could be nothing but the Italian question. Mr. S. Herbert had done justice to Lord Malmesbury, who had been most harshly and unfairly treated, and he complained of the gross and flagrant injustice of condemning any Government before the evidence was produced and their case was seen. In speaking of the defence of the country, Sir John taunted the other side with their silence as to the state in which the late Government had left the Royal Navy. At the time when Lord Derby's Administration acceded to office, the effective strength of the Royal Navy was reduced to a point it had never reached before, and he hoped it would never reach again. There were only 28 effective line-of-battle ships. The present Government had directed their best energies to redress this state of things; at this moment we had 40 effective line-of-battle ships, and at the end of the financial year there would be 50. He enumerated other measures of maritime defence, and asked whether it was for this they were not to be trusted. If they were condemned by a triumphant faction, was it expected that the country would ratify the sentence? This, he insisted, was the true issue; common sense and public feeling would not suffer it to be placed on other grounds.

Lord J. Russell said the Ministers of the Crown having advised the Sovereign to dissolve Parliament at a critical time, in order to ascertain whether they had or had not the confidence of that House, that was the question now before it; yet Sir J. Pakington had stigmatized those who proposed it as a "faction." He (Lord J. Russell) characterized the Government Reform Bill as a measure which would have very much diminished the popular strength in the constituency. With much plausible appearance, he believed that in ten years it would have gone very far to repeal the Reform Act, and he rejoiced in having defeated it. He condemned the dissolution, maintaining that on the showing of Ministers themselves since the dissolution, there was no excuse for it; and that it was their duty to have accepted the amendments of their Bill, and not to have dissolved Parliament. In regard to their foreign policy, he took for granted, he said, that the Government had made sincere efforts to prevent the outbreak of war, and he thought no Government might have been able to preserve peace. In noticing the charge brought by Mr. Whiteside against Lord Palmerston's Italian policy in 1848, Lord John explained the circumstances connected with the proposal that Lombardy should be given up by Austria, and took occasion to condemn in strong terms the transfer of Venice to that Power by the treaty of Campo Formio, which he considered as only second in infamy to the partition of Poland. The whole policy of Austria had been directed to the Government of all Italy. Still,

Sardinia had not been justified in what she had done, and the question was what course this country ought to pursue. Everybody was for neutrality; but he had no confidence that the present Government would be able to maintain a neutral position. His belief was that they were not disposed to keep up that intimate alliance with France on which our influence with France depended. This country had not that weight in the councils of Europe which it ought to have, and, with the view of giving it its proper weight, he was ready to vote a want of confidence in the present Ministers.

Mr. Roebuck said he intended to oppose the amendment. He had to decide what was the best course for himself; to ask, by turning out the present Administration, whom he was to let in, and then to inquire whether those he let in were better than those he turned out. With reference to the question of Reform, he was justified in saying that Lord Palmerston was no Reformer, and he was sure that he and Lord J. Russell would differ on that question, and if they did not differ the House of Lords would resist their Bill. The other (the Government) side, he believed, would bring in quite as good a Bill as those noble lords, and it would be certain of being accepted by the other House. Looking to the welfare of the country, his duty compelled him to support the Government, because he thought it better than any that could be formed on that (the Opposition) side of the House.

The Solicitor-General, after a satirical analysis of the arguments in support of the amend-

[I 2]

ment, and a reply to charges preferred against certain of the Government measures, defended the late dissolution, which had been denounced by Lord Palmerston as unwise and reckless, but which Mr. Bright had declared to have been a wise course. He then passed some severe strictures upon the Carlisle accusations, vindicating Lord Malmesbury from one of them, and blaming Sir J. Graham for carelessly making a statement seriously affecting the personal honour of a Minister of the Crown. Upon the subject of the foreign policy of the Government he gave a distinct denial to statements on the other side, and observed that the condemnation of that policy must be founded upon one of three grounds,—either because the war had actually broken out, or because the negotiations had not been conducted with energy and zeal, or because, since the eruption of the war, the Government had acted in a manner to compromise this country. He contended that neither of those grounds was tenable; and, adverting to the doubts expressed of the sincerity of their professions of neutrality, he asked what was the neutrality of Lord Palmerston, who had said at Tiverton, that if the Austrians were driven out of the North of Italy every one would rejoice. The Government believed that they had, under circumstances of great disadvantage, conducted the internal affairs of the country not without ability or success; that their foreign policy could alone preserve to it the blessings of peace, render it unassailable or not likely to be assailed, and secure those blessings to other

States; and they believed that this policy would be marred and thwarted by the transfer of power at this moment, to the hands of the party opposite.

Upon a division the numbers were as follows:—

For the Amendment	323
Against it	310

Majority against the Government..... 13

This division was decisive of the fate of the Ministry. Their appeal to the people was answered by the representatives of the people, and their retirement from office was the necessary consequence. On the 17th June the Earl of Derby made the expected announcement in the House of Lords. The noble lord said it was hardly necessary for him to inform the House that the result of the division in the House of Commons had left himself and his colleagues no alternative but to tender their resignation to Her Majesty. Although the majority by which they had been beaten was not large, he still regarded it as the expression of the wishes of the country; but, as at the same time it was not condemnatory of any specific part of the policy pursued by the Government, but merely a party move, he did not feel called upon to enter into any defence of his administration. In regard, however, to foreign affairs, he felt convinced that the papers laid before Parliament distinctly showed that a strict and impartial neutrality had been maintained, and that the aspersions cast on Lord Malmesbury were now proved to have been unmerited. He hoped that his successors would not depart from

the policy of neutrality, as he was convinced it was the only course consistent with the interests of the country. At the present moment he and his colleagues were only holding office until the appointment of the new Government, and he believed that a few hours would relieve them from that position. He would encounter that Government with no factious opposition, but would give them an independent and generous support. He proceeded to call attention to the manner in which the communications between Her Majesty and Lord Granville had been made public in *The Times* newspaper, and while he exonerated his lordship from having given his sanction to that publication, he expressed his conviction that Lord Granville's confidence had been abused, and that an improper use had been made of information that ought to have been kept secret. He reiterated his anxious wish that the Government might take their seats as soon as possible, assuring them that they should meet with no obstruction from himself and his colleagues, but that every facility should be afforded them to carry on the business of the country. He concluded by moving that the House should adjourn until the 21st instant.

Lord Granville said he should postpone for the present the Ministerial statement. In regard to what had fallen from Lord Derby, he explained what had taken place when he had been sent for by Her Majesty, and regretted that in communicating with his colleagues and friends he had not used more discretion, by

waiting to make such communication from his place in Parliament.

Lord Brougham hoped that the most perfect neutrality would be observed by those who might be called to the head of affairs, not only towards Austria, but also towards France and her allies, Sardinia, and he grieved to add, Russia. The House then adjourned.

In the House of Commons on the same evening the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose and said, "I think it but respectful to the House that I should formally announce that of which, no doubt, every gentleman is already cognizant—namely, that in consequence of the vote which the House was pleased to arrive at a week ago, Lord Derby and his colleagues felt it to be their duty immediately to tender the resignation of their offices to Her Majesty. Her Majesty was pleased graciously to receive them, and at present we hold our offices, and have held them for some days, only until our successors are appointed. I may also state that the noble lord the member for Tiverton has received the commands of Her Majesty to form an Administration, and I have reason to believe that he has accomplished that task. Under these circumstances, I believe it will be for the convenience of the noble lord, and also of the House, that I should move that this House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next. If any further adjournment be necessary, those who succeed us will have the power and the opportunity of moving it."

The motion was then agreed to.

On the same evening Colonel Forester, the Controller of the

Household, appeared at the bar with the Queen's answer to the Address of the House of Commons. It was in these terms:—

"I receive with much satisfaction the assurances of the House of Commons, that, while I maintain a strict neutrality between the contending parties in the war now raging in North Italy, I may rely on their cordial concurrence in the measures of the defensive policy which have appeared to me to be necessary for the security of my dominions and the honour of my Crown. I am at all times desirous that my Government should be in accordance with the wishes of the representatives of my people in the House of Commons, and I have, therefore, taken measures to act upon the advice which you tendered to me, by the formation of a new Administration."

New writs having been moved for the various places represented by the members of the Administration formed by Lord Palmerston, the Houses again adjourned until the 30th of June. The elections went off favourably to the ministers, all of whom on that day appeared in their places on the Treasury benches. On that evening some statements were made in both Houses on behalf of the new Ministers. In the House of Lords Earl Granville gave an account of the events that had occurred since the retirement of Lord Derby.

On the resignation of the late Government he had received Her Majesty's commands to form an Administration, but he soon found that a far more satisfactory arrangement could be made under the auspices of Lord Palmerston.

Lord Palmerston had succeeded in forming an Administration which contained many whose past political services and character gave them a claim to the confidence of the country. In respect to Reform, it would have been of great advantage to deal with that question at once, especially as public opinion was so strongly fixed upon that measure, and as the late elections had principally turned on that point. Several weeks, however, had been lost to legislation, and, considering the urgent necessity of bringing forward the necessary financial measures for the year, it would not be possible to bring forward a Reform Bill this Session. The subject would in the meantime receive the deepest consideration of Her Majesty's Government, the result of which would be the introduction of a Bill in the ensuing Session. The noble lord proceeded to contradict the rumours which had prevailed in regard to a reduction of our armaments, and stated that it was the decided opinion of the Government that the defences of the country, holding as it did so high and powerful a position in Europe, should be placed in a state of thorough efficiency. In respect to foreign affairs, the policy which would be pursued by the Government would be one of strict neutrality, to keep the country out of the war, and to promote peace, not by intermeddling, but by carefully watching the course of events, and, in co-operation with the other European Powers, endeavouring at an appropriate moment to re-establish a secure peace. Reverting to Lord Derby's promise of offering no fac-

tious opposition, he thought it would be unsafe to build too confidently on such a sandy foundation, yet it impressed him with the certainty that whenever the country required it, all parties would forego their differences to forward the true interests of the nation.

After a few words from Lord Brougham,

The Duke of Rutland drew the attention of the House to a speech of Lord John Russell, in which it was said that "the war was plainly owing to one Power, and that Power was Austria,"—a phrase which he characterized as inconsistent with a strict neutrality. He proceeded to comment on the conduct of the late Opposition, and strongly reprobated their conduct in turning out the late Government in the present critical state of foreign affairs.

Lord Malmesbury wished to give an answer to charges which had been brought against the late Government by Lord Palmerston in another place. He felt convinced that Lord Granville would now be candid enough to confess that the late Government had done everything in their power to preserve the peace of Europe. No language could have been stronger than that which had been used by Her Majesty's late Government. He explained the nature of Lord Cowley's mission to Vienna, and said that the Emperor of the French had himself informed Lord Cowley what points were the subject of dispute, and the alterations which he hoped for. He repelled the charges of Lord Palmerston, who had declared that the late Go-

vernment had produced the war by the course it had pursued, that its language had been patronizing to Austria, but threatening to France and Sardinia, and that it did not, therefore, deserve the confidence of the country. He characterized the statement as a reckless one, and founded on insufficient information, and proceeded to read extracts from Lord Palmerston's speech to show that the late Government had done exactly what Lord Palmerston said they ought to have done. He read copious extracts from the Italian correspondence to show that the policy of the late Government through the course of the negotiations previous to the war had been to impress on the belligerent Governments that this country would, under all circumstances, maintain a strict neutrality, and omit no effort for the preservation of peace.

The Duke of Newcastle thought the present occasion ill-suited to enter upon a question so momentous, especially as a notice of motion on the Italian correspondence had been given for a future day. He begged to assure Lord Malmesbury that there was every disposition on that side of the House to acknowledge that he had done his best to preserve peace as long as possible. Without considering who was to blame for the present state of affairs or who had begun the war, he assured the House that the policy of Her Majesty's Government was to uphold a strict neutrality, and, when possible, to offer their mediation. He could not inform the House whether or not Mr. Cobden had joined Lord Palmerston's Government, but he could state that

if Mr. Cobden joined it, it would be with the full knowledge that the defences of the country would not be diminished, but increased.

Lord Howden hoped that Her Majesty's Government would ascertain whether the phrase of the Milan proclamation, that Italy must be freed from the Austrian from the Alps to the Adriatic, was to be acted upon, or whether it was a mere turn of expression to round a sentence. He exposed at some length the different intrigues of the French Government in Italy, and expressed his opinion that nothing was intended to be gained but the promulgation of an idea among all classes on the Continent that England had been the cause why Italian independence had not been achieved, while the noble efforts of France would elevate her in the eyes of all. This and not the freedom of Italy, was the object the French Emperor had in view.

The discussion then terminated.

In the House of Commons on the same evening Lord Palmerston on laying some papers on the table, took occasion to make a short statement. It was well known, he observed, that on the failure of the endeavours of Lord Granville to form a Government he had been honoured with the commands of Her Majesty, and his first step was to address himself to Lord J. Russell, between whom and himself an agreement had existed that, whoever should receive the commands of Her Majesty, both were to co-operate to form an efficient and a strong Administration. They had been able to surround themselves with colleagues remarkable for their ability and knowledge of

administrative affairs, and he trusted that they had succeeded in presenting to the House an Administration that would be able to command the confidence of the country. This Administration having been formed, it became its duty to consider, in the present state of the public business, what course of proceeding it would be advisable to pursue. With regard to our foreign relations, the course intended was that which had been chalked out by the preceding Government—namely, that of strict neutrality in the conflict now raging in Italy. It would, at the same time, be their duty to avail themselves of any favourable opportunity to tender the good offices of England, either separately or conjointly with other Powers, in order to restore to Europe the blessings of peace. With respect to another important subject, the amendment of the laws for the representation of the people, considering the time of the year, and how short a period remained for disposing of the unavoidable business, it would be trifling with so great a subject to enter upon its consideration during the present Session. Early in the next it would be the duty of the Government to submit a measure upon the subject. Considering the lateness of the Session, and how important it was that the business of the country should be proceeded with as fast as possible, he intended to propose that all Thursdays be order days, instead of notice days.

Sir C. Napier called attention to the defences of the country, and asked for some assurance that the Government would not only keep up, but carry out still

further, the naval preparations of their predecessors, who were entitled, he said, in this respect to the greatest possible credit.

The subject of the defences of the country by sea and land, and the means of securing our shores against a possible invasion, engaged much public interest at this time, and both in the discussions on the Army and Navy Estimates, and on other occasions formed a prominent topic in Parliament. On the evening after that on which the explanations just referred to were made, the Earl of Ripon as Under Secretary of State for War, communicated to the House of Lords the views of the new Government respecting Volunteer Rifle Corps, the formation of which had met with favour and encouragement from the former Ministry.

The noble earl stated that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to carry out the views of the late Administration with regard to the enrolment of Volunteer Corps. He explained that applications had been received from twelve Volunteer Corps in consequence of the circular put forth by the late Government. It was the intention of the present Government to issue 25 stand of arms to every 100 men on the four following conditions:—That a safe range of 300 yards should be provided for practice; that a proper place should be appointed for keeping the arms; that the rules of each corps should be sanctioned by the Government; and that a periodical inspection should be made by a proper military officer. In case, however, of an invasion the Government would be pre-

pared to supply every corps with arms. It was also proposed to provide drill sergeants for each corps, who would be paid, not by the Government, but by the corps themselves. The services of a number of adjutants and sergeants belonging to the disembodied militia, who were receiving instruction at the School of Musketry at Hythe, would be soon rendered available to instruct the various companies of Volunteers. It was the intention of the Secretary for War to allow the officers of the corps at their own expense to attend the School of Instruction at Hythe. The Government also contemplated the formation of artillery companies, which would be supplied with instruction, guns and ammunition by the Royal Artillery. In reply to Lord Aveland he stated that Enfield rifles would be issued to the embodied militia after they had been instructed to use them.

Lord Ellenborough thought there would be some difficulty in obtaining a range of 300 yards near large towns, without endangering the lives of passers by. He suggested that the officer in command should have the power to stop up footpaths near the practising ground during hours of practice.

Lord Ripon said he was sure that Lord Ellenborough's suggestion would receive attention from Government.

Lord Howden, in a speech of much earnestness, declared his opinion that it was the daily wish and nightly dream of every man and woman in France to humble this country by an invasion of its soil, and he strongly advocated the enrolment of Volunteer Corps. Several other

Peers expressed opinions to the like effect.

Lord Brougham, in asking if there were any truth in the reports of a proposed reduction of the Naval Estimates, took the opportunity to inveigh against the horrors of the war now raging, and to review the state of feeling in France towards the English nation. Arguing from the antecedents of France as to its probable conduct, he expressed the strongest opinion that no reductions ought to be made at the present moment in our naval defences.

The Duke of Somerset said there had been no reductions in the Estimates. On the contrary, the Government were convinced of the necessity of keeping the defences of the country in a state of the utmost efficiency.

The Earl of Hardwicke said the French were not only a military, but a maritime Power, and had always manifested the greatest alacrity in supplying the deficiencies of their navy. In 1794 the French had 68 ships of the line and 126 frigates, in which latter class of vessels the English had been lamentably deficient. In spite, however, of the defeat of Trafalgar, the French possessed in 1812, only seven years afterwards, 113 ships of the line and 272 frigates. He proceeded to eulogize the efforts made by Lord Derby's Government to put the navy on a more effective and more powerful footing, and said that, although much had been done last year in increasing its efficiency, much still remained to be done.

Lord Ellenborough thought the importance of our naval defences could not be exaggerated.

Considering the facilities for invasion afforded by steam, and the undefended condition of the southern coast of England, he thought that 60,000 or 80,000 men might during six months of the year be landed on our shores. There was, however, this advantage to be gained by the possession of a powerful navy by this country, that the invading army would be cut off from its communications. While, however, we were so intent on rendering the navy efficient, he expressed a fervent hope that the interests of the army, on which, if a landing were effected, the safety of the country would depend, might not be neglected.

Mr. Sidney Herbert made a statement on the same evening in the House of Commons respecting Volunteer Rifle Corps, and the course intended to be taken by the Government in regard to them, nearly to the same effect as that of the Under Secretary for War. A few days afterwards, the subject having again been raised in the House of Lords,

Lord Ripon, in reply to questions from Lords Vivian, Clanricarde, and Malmesbury, said it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to pay instructors for the Volunteer Rifle Corps; it was simply intended to supply them with trained instructors, who would be paid and boarded by the rifle corps themselves. Neither was it designed to issue pay and uniforms to the corps of volunteer artillery, but only to supply them with guns, ammunition, and instruction. He also stated that Her Majesty's Government had made preparations for the instruction of 25 adjutants and 100 sergeants at

the School of Musketry at Hythe, who, when sufficiently trained, would be employed to instruct their comrades in the use of the Enfield rifle, which would then be issued to the embodied militia.

But by far the most effectual stimulant to the public excitement on the subject of national insecurity was administered by a speech delivered by Lord Lyndhurst in the House of Lords on the 5th of July. This speech, as well from its intrinsic ability and force, as from the great authority of the venerable peer from whom it proceeded, produced a deep sensation throughout the country. In drawing the attention of the House of Lords to the state of the military and naval defences of the country, Lord Lyndhurst anxiously disclaimed all party-spirit. His remarks were with a view not to aggression but defence.

Hitherto, he said, we had relied on what we called our wooden walls as our best defence, and experience justified our reliance. Another source of confidence was the difficulty of transporting troops from the opposite coasts to our own, and under the old system we had perfect security. But now a change had occurred. No one could tell what would be the result of the application of steam power to naval warfare. In a great measure it would deprive us of the advantage we derived from skilful sailors and give numbers an advantage; and, therefore, we could not rely perfectly upon our naval defences. At present we surpassed France in line-of-battle ships, but she was and would be superior in steam frigates. The

French could man a ship as soon as she was afloat with perfectly trained men; we could not. We required a reserve, France did not; because, if we were beaten, we were at her mercy; if she were beaten, we could not invade her. We ought to have a Channel fleet able to combat France and Russia; and a Mediterranean fleet to hold the road to India. We should have a squadron in the West Indies, and a reserve of seamen, which should be created without delay.

Steam bridges the channel as Lord Palmerston had said. France could bring an army together, place it on board without exciting observation, and land it in a few hours on our shores. "I know," continued the noble lord, "that in 1849 when France sent troops to Civita Vecchia, one frigate carried a distance of 300 miles 2000 soldiers with all the munitions of war. I am further aware, that a much larger force than that can be embarked for a short period of time on board a frigate, and a force still greater on board a ship of the line. I know from information which I have received, and the accuracy of which I do not doubt, that the French are at the present moment building steamers for the purpose of transporting troops, each of which is being constructed to carry 2500 men with all the necessary stores. This, therefore, is the description of force which you must prepare yourselves to meet. What then, my lords, does it become our duty to do. What precautions does it behove us to take? What force ought we to maintain in order to be prepared for any emergency which may arise?

My answer is, a force of regular troops—not volunteers—not undisciplined men, but, I repeat, a force of regular troops, capable of opposing any military force which in all probability can be landed on our shores. It is absolutely imperative upon us to maintain such a force. It is a duty which we owe to ourselves. It is a duty which we owe to the character of our country. But, my lords, independently of all this, we must provide for our garrisons, and also for that which is of greater importance still—our arsenals. They are, I regret to say it, at present in a very imperfect state of defence.” He placed the force required at 100,000 men, including the trained Militia. “Every observation, my lords, which I have made on this object applies as well to Ireland as to this country. Perhaps the precautions which I have indicated may be even more necessary in the case of the former than the latter. Ireland may possibly be looked upon on the other side of the Channel as one of the ‘oppressed nationalities;’ as a country trampled upon by a nation differing from her in customs, in language, and in religion. We cannot tell what misrepresentations may be made. We must, at all events, my lords, provide equally for the safety of Ireland as for our own.” He could not glance over the past and compare it with the present without feelings of humiliation. “I recollect the day when every part of the opposite coast was blockaded by an English fleet. I remember the victory of Camperdown and that of St. Vincent, won by Sir J. Jervis. I do not forget the great victory of the

Nile, nor, last of all, that triumphant fight at Trafalgar, which almost annihilated the navies of France and Spain. I contrast the position which we occupied at that period with that which we now hold. I recollect the expulsion of the French from Egypt; the achievement of victory after victory in Spain; the British army established in the South of France, and then that great battle by which that war was terminated. But I may be asked, ‘Why do you think such measures requisite? are we not in alliance with France? Are we not on terms of friendship with Russia? What other Power can molest us?’ To these questions, my lords, my answer shall be a short and a simple one. I will not consent to live in dependence on the friendship or the forbearance of any country. I rely solely on my own vigour, my own exertion, and my own intelligence. Does any noble lord in this House dissent from the principle which I have laid down? I rejoice, my lords, to find that such is not the case. But while this is a matter for congratulation, I regret to be obliged to say that we do not stand well upon the continent of Europe. I do not think late events have improved our position in that respect. But I go further, my lords, and express my belief, as the result of my own careful observation, that if any plausible ground of difference should arise between this country and France, and that difference should lead to hostilities, the declaration of war with England on the part of the Government of that country would be hailed with the utmost enthusiasm, not

only by the army of France, but by the great mass of the French people. If I am asked, 'Will you not rely upon the assurances, and the courtesy of the Emperor Napoleon?' I reply that I have a great respect for that high person, and that I will not enter into any explanation on this subject, but will leave every noble lord to draw his own conclusions, and to form his own opinions. This, however, I will say, and I can say it without impropriety. If I am asked, whether I cannot place reliance in the Emperor Napoleon, I reply with confidence, that I cannot place reliance in him, because he is in a situation in which he cannot place reliance on himself. He is in a situation in which he must be governed by circumstances, and I will not consent that the safety of this country should depend on such contingencies. My lords, self-reliance is the best road to distinction in private life. It is equally essential to the character and to the grandeur of a nation. It will be necessary for our defence, as I have already stated, that we should have a military force sufficient to cope with any Power or combination of Powers that may be brought against us."

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe supported the same view in a temperate speech, and putting aside the question of anxiety, contended that it was humiliating for a great nation like England, to exist for a moment upon sufferance. He hoped the warning would be accepted by the Government.

Earl Granville doubted whether any practical good would result from the speeches which

had been made. Lord Lyndhurst might think it desirable to stimulate the Government, but as regards foreign countries, no advantage would result. The members of the late Government had creditably abstained from imprudent speeches, but other peers on the opposition side had been less guarded and had made remarks ill-adapted to promote peace with our foreign neighbours.

"But I am not sure that the noble and learned lord opposite has been judicious in all he has said. If a feeling of hostility does exist,—as he says it does,—not on the part of the Emperor Napoleon, but on the part of the French people,—I am not certain that his speech will tend to allay it. When he points out, in the most marked way, the defenceless character of our shores,—when at the same time he boasts of our former victories,—and when he makes something like insinuating and sneering allusions both to the Government and the people of France,—I am afraid that, coming from such lips as his, such language is not well calculated to maintain a friendly feeling between the two countries. . . . The noble and learned lord has talked of invasion, but that, I believe, is at the present moment out of the question. While we are on the best possible terms with the United States, while Russia is notoriously not prepared for war, and while France is engaged in a bloody and costly contest in Italy, we are certainly not in danger of an invasion. But what we all feel is, that it would be absolute folly for a great and rich country like England, not to take those permanent precautions which at all times

will relieve us, not only from invasion itself, but from the very alarm of invasion, so injurious as it might be to our commerce." Having criticized the conduct of the late Government in dealing with the question of national defence, while he admitted that they had shown vigour during the present year, the noble lord said, "I quite admit that the army which we now possess, is not large enough to meet any great force coming suddenly upon us, and I think, it is clearly the duty of the Government to direct its attention to those questions of the army, and of defending our arsenals, so as, if possible, to make them impregnable; to consider most carefully those applications of practical science which have already produced weapons of so deadly a character, and, moreover, to consider the very important point of the means of defence against such murderous weapons when directed against ourselves. To these must be added the question of the embodied militia, the experience of which has, I believe, been most satisfactory to the country, and of other systems. I do not know anything that would be more likely to be valuable as a means of defence than the formation of volunteer corps of artillery, while I believe that rifle corps will also afford considerable assistance. It will also be the duty of the Government to consider, how far they can encourage the formation of a reserve. I beg, however, to state explicitly that no person in this House is more convinced of the necessity of putting our national defences in proper order than is every member of Her Majesty's Government."

The Earl of Hardwicke replied to the attacks made on his party, and insisted that our fleet ought to be raised to 100 sail of the line. He was firmly convinced that the man who ruled the French nation would rejoice at a considerable augmentation of our naval strength, because, it would furnish him with a powerful argument against such of his subjects as desired an invasion of this country by France. He believed that that ruler would much rather quiet than stimulate that desire of invasion, and would be glad to see the maritime power of this country raised to a considerable pitch, that the question might not be pressed upon him as to whether he should make war upon England or not.

The Duke of Somerset expressed regret at the exciting language held by members of that House. If such language were persevered in, it would be necessary to have, not a peace, but a war establishment. There was no peace whatever in the language of Lord Lyndhurst. All he said tended to war. That language was calculated to excite the passions of England and France. He well remembered the strong language which Lord Lyndhurst used not long ago when pleading the cause of Italy. His sympathies were then with Italy, but they were now utterly gone, and nothing remained, but his anger with France. During the short time that he (the Duke of Somerset) had been in office, he had done everything in his power to increase the power of this country by sea. He had thought it his duty to continue works in the dockyards which had, indeed, been begun by the late Govern-

ment, but which would have been discontinued had they remained in office, and he had thereby prevented the dismissal of about 3000 men in the dockyards next autumn. He hoped that the people of this country would not be induced by exciting language to demand armaments on a war scale, for the putting of armaments on that scale led to war.

Lord Brougham said, we might increase our preparations without any just offence to foreign Powers. There was no desire for war with England on the part of the French people. As to foreign rulers, he was not bound to express distrust or confidence in them, but we ought certainly to trust ourselves.

The Earl of Ellenborough said the nation had been indulging in a fatal course of self-deception, resting on the memory of past glories, and imagining they were only on the morrow of Trafalgar and Waterloo. We must preserve our naval superiority. France appeared in this war, which was one without justification, as a new Power. The Emperor said he had made no preparations, yet, he had in six weeks placed 200,000 men, fully equipped, in North Italy. This gave a just cause for anxiety, and should induce us to secure our own country against attack.

"What I desire," continued the noble lord, "is that the country shall be placed in that degree of unassailable security, that strength shall be restored to our diplomacy, that we may be able really to interfere with effect in putting an end to this war and preventing the commencement of any other. Until we do that, all our diplomacy is valueless. I

have often heard of 'moral influence.' Moral influence varies exactly as the amount of physical force behind it. No one, I think, unless inspired with a feeling hardly English, can speak of the present ruler of France as one calculated to exercise moral influence in Europe; yet no man in Europe has more influence, because no man commands greater force. And noble lords opposite may depend upon it that, until they place this country in a degree of security which renders it hopeless for France or any other Power to attempt to attack our shores, all efforts to terminate the war by intervention and negotiation will be entirely without avail. It is not safe for this country to remain unarmed in the midst of armed nations, always rivals, and often engaged in hostility to each other. When one nation determines to apply all her energies to making money, and another to making preparations for war, it is obvious enough with which of the two nations the money will ultimately be."

The Duke of Argyll attempted to modify the views taken on the opposition side of the House by suggesting that a re-action would follow, should war Estimates be proposed in a moment of excitement.

The Duke of Rutland supported the views of Lord Lyndhurst.

In the House of Commons on the same evening, Mr. Palk having moved for an Address to the Crown, praying for the issue of the necessary arms, accoutrements, and ammunition to Volunteer Rifle Corps, a discussion took place, in which various opinions were expressed as to

the efficiency and expediency of raising these corps. Some hon. gentlemen spoke slightly of volunteer forces, and thought they would be more injurious than useful. Others, among whom Lord Elcho was most prominent, advocated the opposite side.

The late and present Secretary-at-War both expressed their opinions.

General Peel said the late Government had declined to supply rifles; first, because they had not got them in store; secondly, because the movement, it was understood, should be of no expense to the country. If the Rifle Corps were called out, Government intended to give them everything. We had now 110,000 men in the country; 3600 guns in position; and fifteen complete batteries. The fortifications in progress and in contemplation would cost 4,000,000*l.* He believed the Rifle Corps would be of the greatest possible service, providing the Government did not interfere too much.

Mr. Sidney Herbert, after premising that the discussion which had taken place would do good, said,—“I have been asked whether or not the Government contemplated that the Volunteer Corps would become a permanent institution. If these corps turn out as useful as I hope and expect, they will become part of our permanent establishment; but when I say that, I do not mean that for 20 or even 100 volunteers a single regular soldier will be displaced. We are willing to make as perfect a soldier as we can of every man who is willing to take our pay and subject himself to our discipline. . . . The existence

of the Militia has spread a military feeling and imparted military knowledge to gentlemen of influence in their respective localities. What we want now is to get the middle classes imbued with an interest in our means of defence, and I think the Volunteer Corps will be useful in doing that. The late Secretary for War has doubts, on account of the state of our stores, whether it was wise to issue rifles to these corps. If the present state of our stores had been permanent, I should have hesitated; but seeing there is a rapid increase every week, and that next year our stores will be much enlarged, I thought that instead of allowing our arms to remain useless, it would be better to have men behind them engaged in military exercises. If we had asked the Volunteer Corps to arm and clothe themselves, and pay for their own drill and musket instruction, and done nothing for them in return but put them under military law, the effect would have been discouraging in the extreme. We must have some influence over them, and unless there is some equity in the dealings between us, we cannot expect them to pay due deference to the military authorities. Such, at all events, were the reasons which induced us to offer arms, as far as our means would permit.” In case of war they would be armed. “I have stated that the Government are very anxious to promote the formation of these corps. As auxiliaries I believe they will be most useful. If ever they are made a substitute for a regular force, I believe they will be most mischievous. The gallant officer says that without discipline a population is useless;

but is not that a reason for attempting to drill them while you can?" We have got into a good course, and the Government is grateful to those who have undertaken the formation of these corps.

The motion was then withdrawn.

About the same time Mr. Sidney Herbert carried a motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the effects of the alterations in military organization, affecting the War Office and Board of Ordnance, which were made in the year 1855; and also to inquire as to the necessity of any further changes to secure the utmost efficiency and economy in the administration of military affairs.

On the 8th of July Lord Clarence Paget, the new Secretary to the Admiralty, in moving that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Navy Estimates, entered into a more full exposition than usual of the state of our naval equipments, specifying the exact amount at that time of our force in the channel, available for coast defences. The number of steam-ships of the line in commission was, at home, 12; and in the Mediterranean, 14; total, 26. The number of steam frigates was 16—namely, 13 at home, and 3 in the Mediterranean. Including corvettes, sloops, and other vessels there were 106 in commission, besides a force of gunboats. These vessels constituted our first line of defence. The second line consisted of nine blockships, manned by coast-guard men, which might be made very valuable ships, and the Admiralty proposed to place three of them at three of our principal ports. There was a

VOL. CI.

reserve available in a few days in the event of any emergency in 3400 first-rate seamen on shore, and attached to them a large body of coast volunteers, sufficient to man 12 line-of-battle ships. The construction of ships during this year had been, he said, "marvellous in extent. There were 10 sail of the line ready for commission; there would be three more in the course of the autumn, and one was under repair, so that we had at this time a total of 40 steam-ships of the line, and at the end of the financial year there would be 50 sail of the line afloat (independent of the blockships), 37 frigates, 140 corvettes, sloops, and other vessels of that class. Even this did not represent the naval force of England. There were 231 merchant steam-vessels, which might be easily adapted to receive an armament, and there was yet another source from which our navy could be easily recruited—namely, our merchant yards, where a vast number of vessels might be rapidly built, at the rate of half-a-dozen corvettes per month, over and above the supply from our dockyards. Lord Clarence then proceeded through the different estimates, adding, to make them intelligible, explanation and comment, and he concluded by moving the first vote for an additional number of men.

Sir John Pakington reviewed the several topics of Lord C. Paget's speech, and defended the measure of the late Board of Admiralty.

After a lengthened discussion, both on the sum and details of the Navy expenditure, the votes proposed were carried.

Later in the Session, the Go-
[K]

vernment brought in a Bill with the object of providing a Reserve Volunteer Force of seamen to be used for manning the fleet in case of emergency. In explaining the nature of this measure, Lord Clarence Paget stated that the object was not to increase our fleet, but to enable us to be prepared by sea as we were by land, by having a proper militia to recruit from and as a reserve for our navy. He appealed to the evidence of high authorities in favour of such a force, and to a recommendation in the Report of the Royal Commission of last year that a force of 80,000 men should be enrolled as "Royal Naval Volunteers," on certain conditions. Upon that proposal this Bill was framed, differing from it only in some matters of detail. It was proposed that the men should be invited to enrol themselves for five years, receiving 5*l.* per annum; that they should be called out 28 days in the year for training upon pay; that at the end of five years they should have the option of retiring from the force, or of being enrolled for another period of five years; and that the force should be liable to be called out into active service in any part of the world for two years, with the power of extending their service for two years longer upon increased pay. After stating the provisions as to pensions, he remarked that the measure was an experiment which he trusted might be successful, and that the best means of insuring its success was to promote a better understanding with the seamen in the merchant service, and make them desirous of entering and loth to leave the Royal navy.

Mr. Lindsay stated his objections to the recommendations of the Royal Commission (of which he was a member), and urged the severe discipline of the Royal Navy as the cause of the repugnance of the merchant seamen to entering the Royal service. He recommended that the Bill should be delayed; that the whole plan should be held over for further consideration, and that in the meantime it should be made known that the articles of war would be altered; that excessive drills and arbitrary flogging should be abolished, and that there should be an offer to receive officers as well as men from the merchant service.

Sir Charles Napier, in a discursive speech, touched upon a variety of naval topics, expressing his opinion, among other things, that corporal punishment could not safely be abolished in the navy, but that it should be inflicted only by sentence of a court-martial.

Sir F. Baring said he regretted to hear Sir Charles cast an apparent doubt upon the legality of corporal punishment in the navy. As a friend of peace he believed that in the peculiar position of this country, nothing would more conduce to peace than the having a good naval reserve. He believed that the proposal of the Government was the best that could be made for this object, and that the experiment would succeed. Sir Francis entered somewhat fully into the questions connected with manning the navy.

Sir J. Elphinstone observed that, as the measure was proposed as an experiment, if it did not fully answer, an opportunity

would be offered for entering into the subject again. With regard to the causes which operated to make the navy unpopular with seamen, if the Admiralty carried into effect the recommendations of the Commission, many of those causes would, in his opinion, be removed. He threw out many hints for the improvement of the regulations in the navy.

Mr. Cardwell added a few words, confining himself principally to a defence of the continuous service system. The measure of the Government was passed into a law before the end of the Session.

In moving the Army Estimates on the 14th of July, Mr. Sidney Herbert entered fully into the state of our military arrangements. He stated that our army, small as it was, had been very well administered. We had got what we never had before, 180 guns in service, and 110 in reserve. Aldersholt, which once caused so much dissatisfaction, now contributed greatly to the improvement of the army. Within the last few days he had received a very satisfactory report from the General commanding at that camp, which stated that the drill was good, that the second battalions had made remarkable progress, and that the embodied militia was in a state of efficiency which astonished military men. Earthworks were now thrown up by untrained military labour, a very wise arrangement, and the engineers were making fascines and instructing others in their manufacture. Brigades of infantry and artillery had been sent out a distance of fifteen miles to encamp, and, notwithstanding the great heat of the sun, not a single

man had fallen out during the march. The soldiers had evinced great aptitude in encamping, in erecting temporary ovens, and other works; and there was a marked improvement in their mode of preparing level operations. The Commissariat corps had been practising in the field. Slaughter-houses had been established under the management of the troops, and all the operations for victualling the troops conducted as in time of war. Crime had considerably diminished in the camp, and there had been a marked reduction in the number of deserters. The health of the troops at Aldersholt was something unequalled in the annals of the British or any other army. The sum required to keep up the embodied militia was 410,000*l.*, for gun-factories 4842*l.* The vote for the Royal Carriage department included ten new batteries of 18-pounders, to be employed as a moveable force along the coast. With regard to the delivery of the guns in course of manufacture by Sir W. Armstrong, Mr. Herbert stated that if the new buildings and machinery should be completed by the 1st of October, then he believed that they might expect the delivery of 100 guns by the end of the year, and of something like 200 more by the close of the next financial year. After that, the delivery would go on at a rate which would soon enable us to have, both on board ship and for our land defences, a very large number of these formidable instruments. The vote for miscellaneous stores would be 225,000*l.*; for fortifications 123,000*l.* They only proposed to spend a larger amount this year to

[K 2]

hasten on these works of defence. If executed at all, they should be done as speedily as possible. If England were attacked, our unfurnished fortifications would be much worse for us than none at all; not only useless to ourselves, but capable of being turned against us. At Devonport, Portland, Alderney, and Portsmouth, works were going on. Portland, one of the first harbours in the world, was now utterly defenceless. If an enemy were to take possession of the Isle of Portland, he would have facilities for establishing himself on that height, from which it would be very difficult to dislodge him. Mr. Herbert entered into further details in a lucid manner.

His speech was followed by a debate embracing a great variety of topics. At the close of it, the right honourable gentleman observed that, it might be true that our system was faulty, but if it were faulty, the Government were ready to learn, and, having learnt, they should be ready to act. He advised the Committee to lose no time in getting the best information they could from the most competent witnesses, to enable them to come to a practical conclusion as to the best organization of the War Department. He had recently served on a Commission which had visited many of the barrack establishments in England and Ireland, and he might say he was almost appalled at the amount of work to be done in order to place them on a satisfactory footing, they were not only deserving of, but had received the most earnest attention of the Government, and he hoped he might count upon the support and as-

sistance of the House in carrying the work forward to completion.

Other debates on the defences of the country took place at intervals before the Houses separated. One of these originated in a motion by Sir De Lacy Evans, which was to this effect:—"That, taking into consideration the relations existing between some of the great military powers of the Continent, it is advisable that a Commission be appointed, consisting of civilians and military and naval officers, to inquire into and collect information concerning the present position of our national defences; to ascertain what improvements may be made therein, in order to insure the utmost efficiency combined with economy, and to report thereon to Her Majesty's Government."

Mr. Digby Seymour called attention to the undefended state of the coast between the Needles and Weymouth.

Mr. Sidney Herbert said, that the subject had not escaped the notice of the Government, and there had been a minute examination of the coast, but he was afraid it was impossible to fortify every part of the coast, and attention must be paid, in the first instance, to the great ports and arsenals, which were not in the state he could wish. With respect to the resolution moved by Sir De Lacy Evans, he observed that his attention had been turned to the subject from the time he came into office, and the Government had come to the conclusion to appoint a Commission like that suggested, to consider the plans laid before them for carrying on and completing

the great works of defence to which he had referred.

Mr. Horsman expressed his satisfaction at the assent of the Government to the appointment of a Commission, and offered suggestions as to the subjects of inquiry, and the mode of conducting it.

Lord Elcho observed that the object of Sir De Lacy Evans was, that the Commission should consider the whole question of our national defences, naval and military, the number of men and ships, and our military organization, and not merely the state of the fortifications.

Lord H. Vane differed from Lord Elcho as to the extent of the inquiry. Sir De Lacy Evans said, that his object was that the Commission should take a comprehensive view of all measures necessary for national defence.

Lord Palmerston said the question was of very great importance; but he hoped Sir De Lacy Evans would be satisfied with the statement made by Mr. S. Herbert, and not press his resolution upon the House. He could not agree that the Commission should go into a wide range of inquiry, and examine matters not proper for a Commission. The object of the Commission would be to inquire as to the permanent works for dockyards and arsenals, which would not vary from year to year, whereas the number and composition of our military force and other matters varied according to the circumstances of the country, and for those the Government were responsible.

Mr. Ayrton said the Commission which the Government proposed to grant would not at all meet the object of Sir De Lacy

Evans, which was to inquire into the whole system, and to ascertain the *minimum* means of our ordinary defence, naval and military, against any sudden aggression.

The motion of Sir De Lacy Evans was then withdrawn. Another discussion of the same subject took place on a motion made at the latter end of the Session by Mr. Horsman.

After taking a preliminary review of the Government measures, the honourable Member referred to the state of our works of defence at home and abroad; the sums expended upon them, their defective condition, and the time that would be required to complete them at the present rate of proceeding. If these works were to be done at all, they ought, he observed, to be done at once; and, as the Government had plans which had been well considered, and towards which the House had voted considerable sums, his object was, instead of voting the money by dribblets, that it should be raised at once, and the works completed without delay. He moved, accordingly, "That the expense of completing the necessary works of national defence projected, or already in progress, should be met by a fund specially provided for that purpose, and independent of the annual votes of Parliament." He urged with great earnestness the necessity of carrying our defensive preparations, naval and military, to the highest point of completeness, believing at some future time in the possibility of a war with France, because he saw that the Emperor of France believed in this possibility from the preparations he had made, all

indicative of a gigantic enterprise, at some day or other, against a great naval Power. Adverting to a recent announcement in the *Moniteur*, he remarked that France was as much above the requirements of a peace establishment as England was below them, and that, whatever might be done by any foreign State, there was a *minimum* of power below which this country ought never to fall, and the House ought to raise our defences to that *minimum* point.

Mr. S. Herbert, declining to follow Mr. Horsman into his discussion of foreign politics, and declaring that the Government had, and could have, no offensive designs, observed that, if he touched upon the question of our defences, it was to show the measures we ought to take to put this country in a state of security. He agreed in the necessity of putting our great arsenals, the depositories of re-productive power for our army and navy, in a proper state of defence, and admitted the unprotected condition of some of those arsenals. The Commission lately voted by the House had this object in view. Some members had desired to extend the field of its inquiry; but what he wanted was not to shelve the question, but to have advice upon a specific subject, and the inquiries of the Commission would be confined to that. The first thing was to learn from the Commission what was to be done, and then to do it; but, in the meantime, no work was stopped, and no time would be lost. Until the Commission had reported, the Government could not ask Parliament for a vote; they would then give their

most anxious consideration to the subject.

Sir F. Smith thought Mr. Horsman's motion premature before the Commission had completed its inquiries. Sir Charles Napier dwelt upon the defective manning of our navy, which he attributed to the mismanagement of the Admiralty. With a properly-manned navy, he insisted that there would be no occasion to waste money upon fortifications.

Mr. Cobden observed that it would appear as if we had arrived at a state of things when old appliances were of no use. Enormous sums had been voted for the army and navy, and, having done all this, Mr. Horsman said we had not the *minimum* of establishment we ought to have, and Sir C. Napier had told the House that every man in the country must be set to work. He rose to suggest to the House whether there might not be another view of the subject, and whether gentlemen might not be in a state of panic. He compared the English navy with that of France in 1852 and 1858, whence it appeared that, in 1858, we had 288 steamers more than in 1852, while France had only 142; of sailing vessels we had three less in 1858 than in 1852, and France 114. Taking both steam vessels and sailing vessels, we had 285 vessels more than in 1852, and France only 28. In the calculation of the respective navies we had omitted corvettes, the most important class of war vessels, for he had been told that our large line-of-battle ships would in time of war be mere slaughter-houses. He condemned in strong terms, as disgraceful to our policy, what he termed the preparations

for war with France, while the mouths of our Ministers were filled with expressions of adulation towards its Sovereign, and he called upon the House to give expression to an opinion condemnatory of such a state of things. He denied that there was any ground for supposing that the Emperor of the French or the French people had any design to make war upon this country. He admitted that circumstances gave us a legitimate right to have a larger marine than France by one-third, but France, he said, had never pretended to have the same naval strength as ours. He thought an amicable explanation would adjust this matter. If, after such explanation, the French Government persisted in maintaining a naval rivalry, he would cheerfully vote increased Estimates. But where was the obstacle to such explanation between countries ostensibly friendly? He would not allow the people to be burdened one moment longer than was absolutely necessary.

Sir J. Pakington observed that Mr. Cobden's comparison of the naval strength of England with that of France was erroneous, by reason of his having included in the number of English vessels gunboats, of extremely small size, to the number of 160. Mr. Cobden had spoken of a panic; but did he mean that we ought to trust to amicable professions, without taking any measures of defence and making up past arrears? He regretted that Mr. S. Herbert had not said how far he concurred in the spirit of Mr. Horsman's proposal, or whether we were to go on, year after year, spending dribbets of money for

the fortification of our harbours and arsenals. He warned the Government that a large addition to the expenditure for the navy would be necessary next year.

Lord C. Paget corrected the impression which Mr. Cobden's statement might have made as to the relative state of the English and French navies. The French, he said, had 20 line-of-battle ships in commission and 12 in reserve, equal to ships in commission, making a total of 32. We had 26 line-of-battle ships in commission, and 9 blockships, so that our proportion was not that to which, in Mr. Cobden's opinion, we were entitled. But there was another nation which was increasing her navy, — namely, Russia, which had 8 screw line-of-battle ships, 6 screw frigates, and 9 paddle frigates.

Mr. Bentinck and Mr. Newdegate spoke in favour of Mr. Horsman's motion. Lord Harry Vane recommended that it should not be pressed.

Lord Palmerston said he concluded that Mr. Horsman had accomplished the object he had in view, to impress upon the House the great necessity of completing the fortifications for the defence of our naval arsenals and dockyards, and that these defensive measures indicated no desire on the part of this country to go to war, or to give umbrage to any Power, but were founded upon the common-sense principle that a nation desirous of peace should be able to defend itself against any sudden attack. He hoped, therefore, that he would be satisfied with the result—a very useful one—and not press his motion to a division, which it might be inconvenient to affirm

in the abstract without indicating how the fund was to be provided.

A division was, however, called for, which resulted in the rejection of the motion by 167 to 70.

The speech of Lord Lyndhurst on the danger of invasion, of which mention has been made in a former part of this chapter, having been commented upon with some severity by Mr. Bright in the House of Commons, as calculated to excite alarm, and to embroil this country with the French Government, that noble Lord afterwards took occasion to vindicate the opinions which he had expressed, and to explain his reasons for having called public attention to the subject of our defences. "As to the charge of age, and of being an old peer, he pleaded guilty, and at the same time he duly acknowledged the power of the sarcasm, so pointed, so keen, so bitter, and so creditable to the taste and talents of the hon. member who had made so extraordinary a discovery. As to the charge of making remarks calculated to wound the susceptibility of a neighbouring nation, nothing was further from his intention, which was only to arouse this country to the necessity of putting its defences in an efficient state. It might be the policy of some private individuals, when one cheek was smitten, to turn the other cheek to the smiter, but such was not his feeling nor ought it to be that of a great nation." He concluded his explanations by asking the Duke of Somerset whether he was aware that the French fleet was being armed with rifled cannon, and if it were true that only 100 rifled cannons could be supplied this

year, and 200 the next, to Her Majesty's fleet?

The Duke of Somerset had heard that the French fleet was being provided with rifled cannon, and admitted that the rifled cannon for the armament of our fleet would not be ready for some time. He did not think it expedient at the present time to enter into a discussion of what was being done in our arsenals and dockyards.

On the 9th of August the second reading of a Bill introduced by the Government, to amend the Militia Laws, having been moved in the House of Lords, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe took occasion to express his regret that it was proposed to continue the suspension of the ballot for the Militia at a time when a large force was so much needed for the defence of the country. In the present condition of Europe, which he reviewed at some length, it was not only necessary, but an absolute duty to have a sufficient force to maintain our position and independence as a nation. At present our position was not one of strength, and as long as it remained so, he earnestly hoped that we should not enter into Congress, as we should not do credit to ourselves, nor exercise a beneficial influence for the interests of others.

Lord Kingsdown pointed out the difficulties which existed in finding men for the army, navy, and militia, and insisted not only on the necessity of retaining the ballot for the Militia, but advocated a system which differed in but few particulars from compulsory service, or conscription.

Lord Ripon, while he assured

the House that the attention of the Government had been most earnestly devoted to the subject of procuring sufficient forces for the defence of the country, deprecated the adoption of such measures as those proposed by Lord Kingsdown, especially in time of peace. He thought it expe-

dient to retain the ballot as an extraordinary means for procuring men, but was by no means convinced that it would meet with the approbation of the country under present circumstances, because it would be difficult to distinguish it from the system of conscription.

CHAPTER V.

CHURCH-RATES—Sir John Trelawny again introduces his Bill for their abolition—Debate on the second reading—It is opposed by Mr. Du Cane, Lord R. Montague, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Packe, Lord John Manners, Mr. Disraeli, and other Members—And supported, with some qualification, by Sir George Lewis, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston—The second reading is carried—Mr. Newdegate opposes the Bill at the last stage—He is defeated; but the measure cannot be proceeded with for want of time—In the House of Lords the Duke of Marlborough moves the appointment of a Select Committee on the subject of Church Rates—Remarks of Lord Teynham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Portman, the Bishop of London, and Earl Granville—The Committee is granted. Endowed Schools Bill—Mr. Dilwyn moves the second reading, and explains the objects of the Bill—Sir S. Northcote moves that it be read a second time that day three months—Speeches of the Attorney-General, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Walpole, Sir George Grey, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Henley—The second reading is carried by 210 to 192.—The Bill is afterwards referred to a Select Committee. Roman Catholic Disabilities—Sir William Somerville introduces a Bill to enable Roman Catholics to hold the office of Chancellor of Ireland—The Bill is opposed by Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Disraeli; and supported by Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, Sir George Lewis, and Mr. Cardwell—Arguments on both sides—The Adjournment of the Debate is moved and negatived; but afterwards agreed to, and the Bill is not proceeded with. Revision of the Liturgy—Lord Ebury presents a Petition from a number of the Clergy, praying for a Commission—Speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Earl Powis, Lord Brougham, the Duke of Newcastle, and other Peers—The subject dropped. **FINANCE**—On the 18th of July the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes his Financial Statement—His speech and proposals for raising increased supplies by taxes—General discussion of his plans—Mr. Disraeli, a few days afterwards, enters into an elaborate review of the Financial state of the Country, embracing a survey of Foreign Affairs—He is answered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Speeches of Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, and Lord Palmerston—The Ministerial plans of Finance are adopted, and the Bills passed. The Indian Budget—Sir Charles Wood, on the 1st of August, makes a long

statement of the Financial condition and prospects of India—Lord Stanley explains his views on the subject—Mr. Bright enters largely into the subject of Indian Finance and Administration. The Indian Loan Bill—Discussions in both Houses on the question of an Imperial Guarantee, and on the appointment of a New Financial Minister for India—Speeches of the Duke of Argyll, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Lyveden—The Loan Bill passed. Bill for fixing the limit of European Troops in India—Sir Charles Wood explains the measure, which is criticized by General Peel—Remarks of Sir de Lacy Evans, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Colonel North, Sir Frederick Smith, Colonel Sykes, Sir Henry Willoughby, and other Members—The Bill is passed.

ON the commencement of the Session Sir John Trelawny again introduced his Bill for abolishing church-rates, the principle of which had been adopted by the late House of Commons, though the measure was dropped for want of time to proceed with it. The second reading of this Bill was moved on the 13th of July, by Mr. Dilwyn, Sir J. Trelawny being absent on account of illness, and a debate of some importance took place. Mr. Du Cane moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, and the motion was seconded by Lord Robert Montague in a maiden speech. Both the speeches regarded the Bill as an adverse blow at the Established Church. Mr. Du Cane said that in passing it they would cross the Rubicon once for all, and drive the Church to support itself on the slender reed of voluntary contribution. If the Government supported the Bill the Conservative party would regard it as an open declaration of war. Mr. Edward Baines, speaking on the part of the Dissenters who were opposed to the union of Church and State, said that the Dissenters did not say to the Church, "Stand, and deliver," but they said, "hands off." Mr.

Adderley replied that this Bill did not take that position. It forbade the payment of church-rates, and therefore he regarded it as the prelude to a further attack on the Church. Mr. Mellor contended that the Bill was designed to meet an exceptional grievance. Mr. Pope Hennessy said he had long been of opinion that the attacks made upon the Church of England by Dissenters ought not to be opposed by honest Catholics. The Church of England had been spoken of as the foe, and the Dissenters as the friends of toleration; but the very reverse was the case, and being convinced that it was his duty to support the Church when assailed by the Protestant Dissenters, he should cordially vote against the second reading. Mr. Packe also opposed the Bill. Sir G. C. Lewis made an elaborate speech on the whole question:—Taking the figures of the case, so far as they could be obtained, he showed that while 263,000*l.* was raised for church purposes by church-rates, 260,000*l.* was raised by voluntary contribution. As the rate was not more than 2*d.* on an average, the objection to it was mainly conscientious and not pecuniary. Many members of the Church objected, some be-

cause in large towns they had to maintain a mother church and a district church; others because the incumbent was immoral, or a preacher of eccentric doctrine. In the rural parishes rates were generally made without objection; but in many cases a practical grievance existed where a reluctant minority was controlled by a majority. Several methods of compromise had been suggested—such as making the rate a voluntary or compulsory charge upon land, or levying the rate on Churchmen exclusively; but these compromises were impracticable. One objection made to the Bill was, that if church-rates were abolished, churches would fall into decay. But during the last twenty years church building had undergone a revival, and this country was less likely than any other to be chargeable with the national sin of neglecting to repair its churches. If this compulsory tax were removed no serious difference would be perceived, for funds would be found from one source or another. Sir G. Lewis thus stated the conclusion he had come to.

“As it appears to me that none of the intermediate plans in the nature of compromise are likely to receive the sanction of this House, as I see no prospect of any agreement upon any one of those plans, and as it seems to me that in attempting to maintain the existing system of church-rates we shall only be continuing a fruitless struggle, I am prepared to give my vote for the second reading of the Bill. I would, however, suggest that in the event of the Legislature, either now or at some future period, agreeing to the principle

of the Bill now under consideration, it might be possible to establish an organized system by legislative enactments, which would give some facility and some not inconsiderable assistance, with regard to the receipt, the custody, and the administration of voluntary rates and subscriptions for maintaining the Established Church and meeting the objects to which church-rates are at present applicable. I shall not now lay before the House any detailed plan on the subject, but I think it might be possible to construct an organized parochial system which would be applicable in cases where local funds might prove insufficient. In order to afford assistance to those parishes in which local funds proved inadequate, it might be feasible to constitute diocesan boards, which should have powers with respect to the collection and distribution of money.”

Lord John Manners opposed the Bill; which was warmly supported by Lord Fermoy.

Mr. Drummond made a speech, marked by his usual independent views. When the Lords decided the Braintree case, he said, the bishops ought to have brought in a Bill and placed church-rates on the footing of all other rates. There was a true grievance and a false; a true plea and a false. The true plea was that the mother churches swallowed up the rates and left none to the new churches; the false plea was the plea of conscience.

“The Dissenters have, as I have said before, honestly told you in this House and out of it, that the question is a contest à l’outrance—Established Church or no Established Church. There

is no disguising it. On this ground I oppose the Bill. I opposed the Bill of my right honourable friend the Member for the University of Cambridge, and I will oppose every Bill that enters into a compromise on these matters. For there are questions on which you had better die and be ruined than give way. It is stated of Prince Metternich that a very short time before his death he wrote a letter to the Emperor of Austria, in which he said, 'Make no peace. Fight for what is your own; and rather give up Vienna to be sacked than compromise one tittle of your right.' I say that is the counsel of duty—the counsel of principle; but it is not the counsel of expediency or of Liberalism."

Mr. Maguire said that, as a Roman Catholic, he should vote for the Bill. The perpetuation of the Established Church in Ireland was a grievance to the Catholics of that country, and the Irish Catholic members should remember that they would yet want the aid of the Radical and Dissenting parties in England to strike down that monster injustice.

Lord Palmerston began his speech in these terms:—"Sir—I am anxious to state in a very few words the grounds upon which I shall give my deliberate vote in support of the Bill before the House. I think that I have never hitherto voted for a Bill of this description. I am very glad to see that those who are themselves patterns and models of converts, receive with such joy others who are also converts to an opinion which they have not always entertained. I have thought, and I still think, that it is essential for

the interest and the honour of the country, as well as for the sake of religion, that the fabrics of our national Church should be maintained; and if it had been possible to continue the system by which that object is accomplished by a rate, I should have preferred that that system should be adhered to. But when I find from repeated instances that public opinion not only out of doors, but in Parliament, has been declared strongly and by great majorities in favour of a change in this respect, I cannot set my individual preference against the force of that public opinion, and I am compelled to look about and see whether the same end cannot be attained by some less objectionable means." Lord Palmerston then argued that district churches were at present built and maintained without the aid of church-rates, and our parish churches might be maintained by similar arrangements. Dissenters would contribute voluntarily what they refuse on compulsion. District churches were built and maintained without the aid of church-rates, and our parish churches might be maintained by similar arrangements. "It is said," continued the noble lord, "that the abolition of compulsory church-rates would be destructive to the Established Church. I repudiate that argument. I think it is unfair to the Church of England to put its maintenance upon such a ground. I am convinced that the Church rests upon the affection and respect of the people, and that if it is ever to fall, it will be not by the abolition of church-rates, but by the faults of its own ministers and members. I see no such

faults at the present moment; the contrary, indeed, is manifested in the conduct of the clergy of the Established Church, and I am persuaded that the exemplary proceedings of its ministers and of those who belong to its communion will tend year after year to rivet still more strongly the attachment to it which now exists among the great majority of the people. So far, therefore, from agreeing with those who think that church-rates are necessary and should be maintained for the support of the Established Church, I believe that the abolition of an impost which is disliked not only by Dissenters, but in many cases also by members of the Church itself, would tend to strengthen and extend the established religion of the country."

Mr. Disraeli commented on the changes of opinion of various persons, especially of Lord Palmerston. Had he come forward in a manner befitting the difficulties of the occasion, or the position which he occupied? His speech implied that he favoured the voluntary system. No one had impressed Parliament with the conviction that the abolition of church-rates was revolutionary more than Lord John Russell. Mr. Disraeli contrasted with the conduct of Ministers the manly cause pursued by Sir John Trelawny. "He thinks that church-rates ought to be abolished; he does not think that a substitute ought to be supplied. But the Ministers are not of that opinion. I do not refer merely to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, with whose extravagant notions I never could agree, because I could never think that church-

rates were in the English Constitution what the noble lord has more than once represented them to be, but some of his colleagues have to-day, in their more temperate view of the question, acknowledged that if the proposed change took place, a substitute ought to be furnished. What I say, then, is, that if such is their opinion, they are bound to supply that substitute; or, at all events, not to support any measure which is recommended to the House without proposing that remedy which they think desirable." Admitting the present case of things to be unsatisfactory, but declining to discuss the merits of the Bill, Mr. Disraeli declared that Ministers ought to make an attempt to settle the question, and not leave it to the Committee. "I am quite certain that no Ministry is justified in voting for the abolition of church-rates, while at the same time it acknowledges that a substitute ought to be supplied, and shrinks from the responsibility of affording the remedy which the country has a right to demand."

Lord John Russell reminded Mr. Disraeli that when he tried to prevent the abolition of church-rates, the Conservative leader gave him no assistance, but was silent. But now, when public opinion was in favour of abolition, he made a speech of despair. Lord John contended that there was no injustice in church-rates, and that his previous arguments had been directed against those who say there is. The party now becoming more popular, said that these rates might be abolished to the advantage of the Church: That was the view of the Conservative candidate for the West

Riding. Then there was a majority in the House favourable to their abolition. The compromises proposed would have drawn a line of separation between Churchmen and Dissenters, and would have degraded the Church into the position of a powerful sect. If church-rates were abolished, voluntary contributions had so increased that the churches would be maintained. "Neither my noble friend nor myself say that the exaction of church-rates is unjust and intolerable, but we do say, looking at the state of public opinion, that it will be better and safer for the Church to rely upon the voluntary offerings of the people than to continue a compulsory rate which is disliked by almost all classes of the community."

Upon a division there appeared:—For the second reading, 263; against it, 198—majority, 70.

On the motion that the Bill be committed on the 26th July,

Mr. Newdegate moved, as an amendment, a Resolution that the House would that day resolve itself into a Committee, to consider the propriety of establishing, in lieu of church-rates, thenceforth to be abolished, a charge on all hereditaments in respect of the occupancy of which church-rates had been paid within the last seven years, to be levied with the county-rate at an uniform rate of poundage, the occupier being in all cases entitled to deduct from his rent the amount of the charge levied on his occupation to be paid to the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, who should be empowered to administer the same for the purposes of church-rates. He did not pro-

pose, he said, to alter one word of the Bill; he accepted the decision of the House that church-rates should be abolished, and he proposed this charge, at the rate of 2d. in the pound, as a substitute that would satisfy conscientious scruples, and obviate the objections made to church-rates. Where these rates had been abolished let the abolition, he said, be sanctioned; but let not this limit be exceeded, and the whole burden be cast upon the voluntary system, which was already deficient to a considerable extent.

Mr. Dodson opposed the Resolution. This tax, he contended, had always been voluntary, for the Church never had the power to say, "You shall make a church-rate;" it had only the power to enforce the repair of churches by a process at present obsolete and ineffectual, and the parishioners now made a rate only when they pleased. The Resolution would substitute for a rate voluntarily made a fixed burden.

Lord Henley considered that the remedy suggested by Mr. Newdegate, would be worse than the disease he proposed to cure. Sir John Trelawny urged various objections to the Resolution. Sir W. Farquhar said that, though opposed to the abolition of the rates, he could not support Mr. Newdegate's proposition.

Upon a division, the amendment was negatived by 191 to 99, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, but very little progress was made on this occasion, and owing to the short duration of the Session, it was found impossible to proceed with the Bill this year.

The question of church-rates

was also raised in the House of Lords, upon a motion made by the Duke of Marlborough, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the subject. The noble duke, in introducing his motion, proceeded to review the inquiries and attempts at legislation which had already taken place on the subject. His own opinion was that the abolition of church-rates was a blow aimed at the Established Church, and though the Session was short, he had no doubt that before it was over, the Select Committee would have collected a mass of evidence which would be of the highest importance. He trusted that their Lordships would ever be found the best defenders of the Established Church, which was the surest safeguard of an hereditary monarchy.

Lord Teynham said the Church of England was the "rich man's church." He thought the Committee would do well to terminate the strife which sprung out of church-rates, by recommending their abolition.

The Archbishop of Canterbury thought the House owed a debt of gratitude to the Duke of Marlborough for bringing the question forward. The remedy for the honest scruples of Dissenters to church-rates, need not be the extreme measure of releasing property from an obligation to which it had always been subject.

Lord Portman thought that the matter might have been settled long ago, if the Church had been willing to accept some of the propositions that had been made. He could not but fear that if the settlement were much longer de-

layed, a collision would take place between the two Houses of Parliament.

The Bishop of London defended the Church from the imputation made by Lord Portman, and denied that any encouragement had ever been given to any one to undertake the settlement of the question. Under these circumstances, he thought the bench of bishops had exercised a wise discretion in not originating any measure on the subject of church-rates. He thought that the abolition of these rates would be a blow aimed at the Established Church, which was the Church, he might remark, of 83 per cent. of the population of England, and that a large body, even among the Dissenters, would deplore anything which tended to weaken that Church.

Earl Granville, on the part of the Government, thought the proposed inquiry would lead to no good. He did not, however, feel justified in opposing the appointment of a Committee, which was accordingly agreed to.

A Bill introduced at the commencement of the Session by Mr. Dilwyn, on the subject of Endowed Schools, produced a somewhat warm contention in the House of Commons, which was terminated after the second reading of the measure had been carried, by referring the Bill to a Select Committee of the House. Mr. Dilwyn, in introducing his Bill, complained that the grievance which he sought to remedy was that which had arisen from the interpretation put by Courts of Equity upon the trust deeds of schools, whereby the exclusive control was given to the Church

of England of all schools which the founder had not specifically devoted to Dissent. The founders, he said, intended to educate the community generally, but their intention was, in many instances, frustrated by the application of this doctrine.

The legal contention and decision in the year 1857 on the case of the Ilminster School, founded in the reign of Edward VI., had gone far to bring this question to an issue. In that case the school was founded for the benefit of the poor generally, who were, in the terms of the endowment, to be given a virtuous education, and taught their duty to God and the King's Majesty. The trustees were to be "honest men of the parish of Ilminster," without reference being had to their religious opinions; and for 150 years the school had been well administered by trustees coming within that designation, who had invariably been churchmen and dissenters in varying proportions, but the churchmen preponderating. About two or three years ago, a new light appeared in the parish in the person of a fresh vicar, who objected to the presence of dissenters in the trust. Subsequently, when, the trustees having dwindled down to three dissenters, it became necessary to reconstruct the trust, the Master of the Rolls judiciously appointed twelve churchmen and three additional dissenters, thus making the churchmen two-thirds, and the dissenters one-third of the whole number. The vicar, objecting to the presence of the six dissenters, appealed to the Lords Justices, and the result was that the names of the dissenters were struck out of

VOL. CI.

the trust. Mr. Dilwyn admitted he did not see how the Lords Justices, starting as they did from false premises, could have come to any other conclusion; but their judgment showed how bad the existing law was as expounded by them. Starting, as he had said, from false premises, they arrived at a *reductio ad absurdum*; for the practical meaning of this decision was, that no dissenter could be "an honest man." He asked the House if it was likely that the dissenters of this country would be content to remain under such a ban. His Bill merely sought to enact that no endowed school or educational charity should be deemed to be founded for the purpose of affording religious education according to the principles of the Church of England exclusively, unless from the language of the deed of endowment it appeared that such was the intention of the founder.

Sir Stafford Northcote moved that the Bill should be read a second time that day three months. He said the Bill would alter the present position of dissenters and churchmen in regard to school trusts, and take away the rights of the church. He did not desire to deal with the question in a sectarian spirit. There were legislative provisions for admitting dissenters to the benefit of education in church schools, and he should be glad to see an inquiry instituted, in order to ascertain how these endowments might be made more useful.

Mr. Puller seconded the amendment.

The Attorney-General observed that it was because there were artificial presumptions and rules

[L]

of construction in our Courts inconsistent with public utility, that a ground was laid for further legislation in this matter. And this was in conformity with the opinion of the Judges themselves, who found themselves compelled to regulate their interpretation of the law according to those rules and presumptions. Admitting, with Sir S. Northcote, that it would be necessary to alter the language of the Bill, as well as the great difficulty of laying down proper rules of construction, he pointed out reasons which showed, he said, the great necessity for some further legislation upon the subject, in order to do away with arbitrary and technical rules which, in his opinion, it was neither wise in the Church of England, nor for its interests to maintain. He admitted that the true difficulty in these cases was to find the real intention of the founder, and the principle of the Bill was to prevent that intention from being inferred from extrinsic circumstances which ought not to be appealed to as evidence. He should vote for the second reading, with the understanding that the language of the Bill should be materially modified.

Sir Hugh Cairns admitted that the dissenters had just claims, but he replied to the last speaker by alleging that the reasons assigned were incompatible with each other. Would he adopt the principle of usage, or the principle that the will of the founder must be consulted and followed? He thought it would be desirable, in order to prevent the necessity of going into the Court of Chancery in respect to every particular case, that some general measure

should be passed, though that could only be done after a general inquiry into the state of the educational charities, allowing, where the foundation permitted, the introduction of "conscience clauses." The present state of things in this respect was a grievance of which dissenters might properly complain, but which the present Bill did not at all attempt to touch.

Mr. Mellor supported the motion, but admitted that the language of the Bill was open to objection.—Sir George Lewis showed, from the speeches on the other side, that the evils of the present state of things demanded a remedy. He thought, however, that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, where the evils could be satisfactorily ascertained, and the proper remedy devised. Mr. Arthur Mills and Sir Erskine Perry supported the motion. Mr. Walpole entered into an elaborate argument against the Bill, to show that it would alter the law of evidence in favour of a particular class, and establish the principle that usage in future was not to guide the interpretation of particular trusts.

Mr. Bright said the Bill would take nothing from the Church of England. He hoped they should not see any members of a Government, calling itself Liberal, going into the lobby against the Bill.

Sir George Grey observed that the course of the debate had established a practical grievance, and it had also appeared that great doubts existed whether the Bill was capable of applying a sufficient legislative remedy. The grievance was that many ancient educational trusts, intended for the benefit of the whole commu-

nity, in the lapse of centuries and by a change of circumstances, had a partial operation given to them; but he doubted whether the Bill would effect a remedy, and whether some previous inquiry was not necessary. The difference between inquiry before the second reading and after was so small that, if the motion came to a division, he should vote for the second reading.

Lord J. Manners thought the Bill was not in such a form that the House could fairly be called on to express an opinion upon its principle, and if the second reading were negatived, he believed hon. gentlemen on that side of the House would be ready to assent to the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire how far, having regard to the declared intentions of founders, educational charities in England and Wales could be made available for the children of persons dissenting from the doctrines of the Church of England.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer supported the proposition to refer the Bill to a Committee. Mr. Henley was also willing to have an investigation into the facts, though he did not mean to pledge himself to the necessity for legislation.

After a reply from Mr. Dilwyn, the House divided, when there appeared—

For the second reading 210

Against it - - - 192

Majority - - - 18

Sir George Lewis then moved to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. After considerable discussion, this proposition was carried. No legislation, however,

on the subject, took place during this Session.

A Bill involving an important constitutional principle, was introduced during this Session by Sir William Somerville, and led to a rather warm debate on the second reading, but to no ulterior result. The object of it was to remove one of the existing disabilities to which Roman Catholics in Ireland are subject, by making persons of that religion competent to hold the office of Chancellor of Ireland. This Bill provoked a vigorous opposition from the Conservative side of the House. Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Disraeli, were the leading speakers on this side. Their argument against the measure was that Sir Robert Peel in 1829 deliberately excluded Roman Catholics from this office, because the Lord Chancellor is the representative of the Crown, because he exercises ecclesiastical patronage, because he may exercise functions as a judge in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, may become patron of livings appertaining to lunatics and others, may become Regent of the kingdom; because he is the adviser of the Lord-Lieutenant, and because it is unwise to disturb the great settlement of 1829. Mr. Whiteside said the measure was the most indecent proposition ever submitted to Parliament, because it proposed that a Roman Catholic should decide questions touching the doctrine of the Church of England.

On the other side, were Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, Sir G. C. Lewis, and Mr. Cardwell. They showed that the Lord Chancellor had no ecclesiastical

[L 2]

patronage, except that of appointing, in conjunction with five other persons, to two livings: that his functions, in a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, were merely ministerial; that none but a Protestant could be a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and that a Roman Catholic could never become Regent. The Relief Act established the rule that Roman Catholics might hold purely civil offices, and its principle was the equality of civil privileges. Exception was made in the case of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, because it was erroneously supposed that he exercised ecclesiastical functions, and enjoyed ecclesiastical patronage. But that was not so. "Will any man contend," said Mr. Gladstone, "that the office of Lord Chancellor in its main scope and purpose is anything but a civil office? If he has other functions, which take up one-sixth of his time, is it for those functions that the office exists? Is it not, in substance, a legal and judicial, but strictly secular, duty that he is called upon to discharge? And if there are these rags and shreds which the right honourable gentleman describes, does not the Lord Chancellor go on year after year discharging legal functions, and does any one dream of those phantoms of an appeal upon questions of ecclesiastical discipline which disturb the mind of Mr. Whiteside?"

In the course of the debate, Mr. Gladstone congratulated Mr. Whiteside on his appearance as the defender, almost the disciple, of Sir Robert Peel; and Lord Palmerston said, "I certainly must condole with honourable

gentlemen opposite, upon the abrupt dissolution of what, without disrespect, I may call the holy alliance which not long ago existed among them."—(*Laughter.*)

Mr. Disraeli did not take such decisive ground of opposition as his late colleagues, but contended that the Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee, in order that the House might know clearly what were the functions of the Irish Chancellor.

Sir George Lewis was willing to agree to this proposition, provided the Opposition would allow the Bill to be read a second time. But this they would not consent to, and Sir William Miles moved the adjournment of the debate, which was negatived by 210 to 142. The same motion, however, being repeated, Lord Palmerston, at a late hour, gave way, and the motion was adjourned and not renewed.

On the 29th of July, a petition was presented by Lord Ebury to the House of Lords, from certain of the clergy of the Established Church, praying the House to address the Crown for a Royal Commission to revise the Liturgy. The noble lord stated that it was signed by between 400 and 500 of the clergy. He commended it to the serious attention of the House, containing, as it did, a compendious statement of the whole of the alterations that were desired by any party in the Liturgy of the Established Church, though the petitioners might not be unanimously agreed as to the whole of those alterations. He might say, without fear of contradiction, that the statement embodied the opinions of the majority of reflecting laymen of the Church of England,

and also of a large portion of the clergy. He might add that a similar petition had been signed by no less than 10,000 of the laity in one city alone. He need not inform their Lordships that he had been prevented by the Dissolution, the change of Ministry, and other causes, from bringing forward this subject in the present year, but he gave notice that he would do so in the course of the next Session. He regretted that since he last brought the subject forward, Convocation had given to his appeal a most emphatic refusal; and those who took an interest in the revision of the Liturgy now felt that the only prospect they had of attaining their object was by an application to Parliament.

The Archbishop of Canterbury felt obliged to the noble lord for not bringing forward this question in a formidable way at this period of the Session, when it could not have obtained the consideration which its importance deserved. When the noble lord did bring the subject forward, he and his right reverend brethren would be ready to give it the fullest consideration and discussion.

The Bishop of London said he felt perfectly convinced that no one had the interest of the Church more truly at heart than the noble lord who had just brought forward the petition. The noble lord represented, as he said, the intelligent laity of the country in wishing the services of the Church to be shortened. Now, he (the Bishop) was free to confess that many of the intelligent and of the unintelligent laity were desirous of shortening the services of the Church, but the way in which they proposed to do this very seriously affected

the doctrines of the Church. Some proposed to shorten the services by leaving out the Athanasian Creed, others proposed to omit the observance of saints' days. The petitioners said that they did not wish to introduce any new doctrine, but by thus leaving out existing doctrines, the general doctrine would really be altered in a most important degree. He and his right reverend brethren constantly exercised the power they possessed of allowing clergymen to read the Litany alone at stated times. If this were always done, those who wished it would have an opportunity of attending a short service. The real difficulty which bishops and clergymen met with in attempting to introduce improvements in the arrangements of the Church services was, that the great majority of their congregations were opposed to the introduction of any change at all. He believed that the good at which the noble lord aimed, might be better obtained in other ways than those he proposed; and he thought that by adopting hastily the wish of the petition, evil would arise which the noble lord himself would be the first to regret.

Lord Ebury explained, that the omission of the Athanasian Creed was not one of the objects of this petition. What the petitioners desired, was only the omission of repetitions arising from a junction of several services in one.

The Earl of Powis complained that the questions of abbreviation and alteration had been a good deal mixed up together; and that those who desired alteration had availed themselves of the pretence

that they only sought for abbreviation. These petitioners, for instance, declared that they desired the introduction of no new doctrine, but at the same time they proposed to banish the Athanasian Creed, to omit passages from the burial service, to clear the absolution service from the appearance of giving absolution by priestly authority, to remove the sponsorial element from the baptismal service, and to amend the service of confirmation and the catechism, so as to make them accord with these alterations. These omissions would produce as great a departure from the standard of primitive truth as might the introduction of entirely new doctrines. If a reformation, or rather a revolution, was intended, let that be stated at once, and not be disguised under the expression that no change of doctrine was intended.

Lord Dungannon was opposed to any change in the Liturgy, and disbelieved in any general desire for it on the part of the laity. He thought that these questions ought to be left in the hands of the bishops and clergy.

Lord Brougham thought that House a most unfit assembly to discuss questions of a theological character. No doubt there were many parts of the Liturgy which might be amended, or at least shortened; but matters of this kind were better left in the hands of the right reverend bench, who had already power under the Crown to do anything which was necessary.

The Duke of Newcastle was not ready to admit that the laity ought to be excluded altogether from the consideration of ques-

tions of this character, but he thought the initiative ought to be left in the hands of the bishops and clergy, and not taken by either House of the Legislature. Constituted as the right reverend bench was at present, it represented all the various opinions of the Church, and if they were of opinion, as it appeared they were, that it would be dangerous to adopt a proposition of this sort, their opinion ought to be deferred to. He hoped that before the noble lord fulfilled his intention of bringing forward this subject next Session, he would be ready to state what it was that he proposed to do, since he had stated that at present he was not prepared to indorse the whole prayer of the petition.

After a few words from Lord Ebury in reply, the petition was ordered to lie on the table.

On the 18th of July, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Gladstone) in a Committee of the whole House, made his financial statement. He presumed, he said, that it would be for the convenience of the Committee to follow the usual practice, and to make known the result of the finances of the past year. The total revenue of the year had been estimated at 63,900,000*l.*; it had produced 65,477,000*l.* The total actual expenditure had been 64,663,000*l.*, against a revenue of 65,477,000*l.*, leaving a surplus of 800,000*l.* The result of the duty upon draughts and cheques could not be correctly ascertained. Its amount had been estimated at 300,000*l.*; but he thought it would not exceed 200,000*l.* There was an exemption of cheques drawn by the proprietor and paid to him over the counter, and this

exemption he should propose to remove. The equalization of the spirit duties, which was a measure of fiscal reform independent of pecuniary results, had been estimated to yield an additional revenue of 500,000*l.*; but the produce in 1858-59, as compared with 1857-58, showed an increase of only 85,000*l.* There was a prospect, however, of the duty being considerably more productive. Mr. Gladstone then addressed himself to what he termed the more grave and serious part of his task, by stating the estimated amount of the revenue and expenditure of the current year, and the extent to which the latter would exceed the ways and means, or ordinary revenue of the country.

Estimated Revenue :—

Customs	£23,850,000
Excise	18,530,000
Stamps	8,100,000
Land and Assessed Taxes	3,200,000
Income Tax	5,600,000
Post Office	3,260,000
Crown Lands	280,000
Miscellaneous	1,530,000
	<hr/>
	£64,340,000

Estimated Expenditure :—

Funded and unfunded	
Debt	28,600,000
Charges on Consolidated Fund	1,960,000
Army (including Militia)	13,300,000
Navy (including Packet Service)	12,732,000
Civil Services	7,825,000
Revenue Departments	4,740,000
	<hr/>
	£69,207,000

The estimated revenue being 64,340,000*l.*, and the estimated expenditure 69,207,000*l.*, there would be a gross deficiency in the current year of 4,867,000*l.*

This being the time when it became the Committee to make adequate and effective provision for the wants of the year, it was likewise a time when its attention should be rigidly confined to the wants of the year, the charges being of an exceptional character, especially those for the army and navy. The Committee, therefore, were not to busy themselves with comprehensive plans of finance upon the present occasion; next year it would be necessary to enter upon larger views of our financial system, for next year the income-tax would lapse, as well as certain war duties upon tea and sugar, and on the other hand, the Long Annuities would fall in. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, would not enter upon considerations of prospective finance; they confined themselves to temporary and provisional finance. He now asked the Committee to consider what modes of supply could be devised to meet the deficiency in the Estimates. Nothing, said Mr. Gladstone, but dire necessity, could justify our borrowing in time of peace. We should provide for the wants of the day in which we live out of the resources at our command. If then we must look to taxes, shall they be direct or indirect? The articles that could be subjected to indirect taxation are malt, spirits, tea, and sugar. The Government agree that it would be undesirable to augment the duty on malt. As to spirits he showed from statistics that the process of equalizing the duties since he began it in 1853 had been successful. The total receipts in 1853 were 6,301,000*l.*, in 1859, 9,188,000*l.*, an increase of 2,887,000*l.*, a real

addition to our permanent taxation. But as malt gave no hope, so spirits yielded no means of replenishing the treasury. In the same way Mr. Gladstone dealt with tea and sugar, those more vital articles, and declined to meddle with the indirect taxes, and thereby touch the labouring man. He showed that while in 1858-9 part of the war taxation on sugar and tea which would have been remitted was retained, the war portion of the income-tax was struck off, and that last year indirect taxation paid a larger proportion than direct taxation. It would, therefore, be a gross injustice to add one shilling to the imposition of indirect taxation. "That being so we arrive at a point which can be easily anticipated. The divining faculty of an intelligent audience altogether outruns either the power or necessity of a detailed statement. It remains to consider what we shall do with the income-tax." Having explained the purposes which led to the introduction of the income-tax—to make salutary fiscal changes, and to meet sudden exigencies—he described the present case as one of the latter class, and the income-tax as the legitimate resource. Then he referred to the promises made in 1853, and showed, from the increase in the revenue (5,816,000*l.*), and the falling in of the Annuities, that, had not public expenditure grown also, the promises of 1853 could have been kept, and the income-tax abolished in 1860. As the expenditure had increased it must be met by corresponding taxation. In the first place he proposed to diminish the malt credits from eighteen to twelve

weeks. Under the present system the maltster made and sold his malt before he paid duty, that is, the public found him capital. That was a bad system, and he proposed to deal with it at present in the mildest way by diminishing the period of credit, which would yield 780,000*l.* to the treasury in the current instead of the next year. That would reduce the deficiency to 4,000,000*l.* That sum we proposed to raise by the augmentation of the income-tax. The present rate of the income-tax was 5*d.* in the pound. He proposed an additional 4*d.* in the pound. An addition of 4*d.* in the pound would yield something over 4,000,000*l.* of money. "In making an addition of that kind it will be necessary," (continued Mr. Gladstone) "to reintroduce the distinction between incomes above 150*l.* and incomes under 150*l.*; because that distinction was originally introduced when the rate was at 7*d.*, and was allowed to drop when it fell to 5*d.*; but when it goes above 7*d.* there cannot be a doubt that the distinction must be reintroduced. Therefore, what I propose is that the 4*d.* laid upon the general mass of the income-tax payers should stop at incomes of 150*l.*, and that the rate of 1½*d.* in the pound should be laid upon incomes under 150*l.* The whole of this addition to the income-tax will be made applicable to the service of the year by being charged on the first half-yearly payment. If I am to have that money for the service of the year, it must be in the Exchequer before the 1st of April, nor can it be by any means that I am aware of in the Exchequer before the 1st of April, unless it

is made leviable in one single payment, on the first assessment or charge, after the Resolution shall be adopted by the House. I wish to explain to the Committee exactly how the payments will stand. The effect of my proposal is to place an addition of $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ in the pound upon all incomes under 150*l.*, and upon all above 150*l.* an addition of $6\frac{1}{2}d.$, or at the annual rate of 13*d.* on all incomes above 150*l.* But the first half-yearly payment of the tax-payers whose income is under 150*l.* a year will be at 4*d.* in the pound. The remaining liability for income-tax for 1859-60 will stand exactly as it does now, at $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ for both classes. That, with the malt credits, will yield 5,120,000*l.*, thus leaving only a surplus of 253,000*l.* I estimate that the balances in the Treasury in April, 1860, will be 6,542,000*l.*, an ample amount." Mr. Gladstone concluded his statement by proposing a formal vote of ways and means, and laid on the table two Resolutions relating to malt and income-tax, to be considered on a subsequent day.

Several members made strong objections to the proposed mode of levying the income-tax, and some taunted Mr. Gladstone with his former opinions, but the majority of speakers approved of the augmentation of the tax.

Mr. Horsman objected to the making of additions to our defences by instalments, and recommended the application of a round sum once for all.

Mr. Gladstone admitted there was some force in the remark; but said that the question could hardly be discussed then.

The Resolution was then adopted.

Three days afterwards it being proposed to go again into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Disraeli embraced the opportunity of making, as he said, "a few observations" on the financial condition of the country. His comments were, however, extended to a great length, and led to a debate, not only on finance, but on foreign policy. The right honourable gentleman began by an elaborate defence of his own financial arrangements, and justified the postponement of the payment of incumbrances in 1858 on the ground that the commercial classes were then just recovering from a severe monetary convulsion. The Government thought it unwise to interfere with the legal reduction of the income-tax from 7*d.* to 5*d.*, and preferred to call for the outstanding 1,000,000*l.* of the loan, and thus pay off 2,000,000*l.* of Exchequer Bonds out of the balance, instead of raising new taxes. They hoped to meet the deficiency out of the excess of revenue. The estimate of revenue was 64,000,000*l.*, and the receipts were 65,500,000*l.*, showing a surplus of a million and a half. His policy had been not to maintain artificial sinking funds, and not to raise new taxes from an industrious people smarting under great disasters. Proceeding from the past to the present, Mr. Disraeli expressed his approval of the determination of Mr. Gladstone to increase the income-tax, rather than borrow; but he objected to the mode of levying the additional income-tax, and insisted that the levy of the special tax in six months instead of a year would inflict great injury. All the desired results might be ob-

tained by spreading the levy over a year, and obtaining from the Bank of England the accommodation required. We ought not to fritter away this treasure—the income-tax. As to our general financial position Mr. Disraeli contended that we could not go on raising 70,000,000*l.* a year. We must enforce economical administration. It was quite an illusion to hope that we could materially reduce our three great sources of civil expenditure—the administration of justice, the education and the health of the people. If we made war upon these estimates we really made war upon civilization. Coming to the naval and military estimates he said that enormous as they were, some thought they ought to be increased. Now expenditure depended on policy. A war had just unexpectedly terminated, in which we took no part. The late Government, though their policy was misrepresented, maintained strict neutrality. A change might have been expected to follow a change of Government, but the new Ministers had at once announced their intention to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. The value of that statement was increased by late events. We had a peace which did not disturb the political equilibrium. That was satisfactory. But there was a talk of a Congress or Conference. Would they thrust themselves therein and enter into engagements from which we could only reap disorder and ruin? In 1815 we were entrapped into engagements. Would they be entrapped by some ebullition of disappointed feeling into this Conference at Zurich, and into engagements that must lead to in-

creased expenditure? A peace that did not disturb the balance of power we ought to respect. But it was said the programme of the Emperor had not been realized. He defied them to find in history an instance in which the objects of a war were realized. At the end of the Russian war there were lamentations that its objects were only partially accomplished. Was, therefore, the successful conqueror to be held up as a Prince whom no one could trust, because he had not done what no potentate had ever done—realized his programme? He gave credit to the Prince who signed the peace, and believed it would be permanent. Let us do our best to make it permanent. What then should be our policy? Not to go to Congresses in fine dresses, with ribands and diamonds, and snuff-boxes, but to go to our great ally and ask him to join us in making peace permanent by diminishing armaments. The late Government were told that they did not enjoy the confidence of the Emperor of the French, and that had the distinguished statesmen opposite been in office, he would not have taken a step without consulting them. Now, then, was the time for Lord Palmerston to act a great part, by exercising his influence with France to terminate this disastrous system of warlike expenditure. Let them mutually agree, with no hypocrisy, but in a manner which would admit of no doubt—by the reduction of armaments—that peace was really their policy, and then the Chancellor of the Exchequer might look forward with no apprehensions to his next budget, and the country might then actually ex-

pect the termination of the income-tax.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer passed over those parts of Mr. Disraeli's speech referring to retrospective finance, except so far as to characterize the 1,500,000*l.* surplus as a fancied surplus, and to point out that the actual surplus was the excess of income over expenditure—800,000*l.*—and entered upon Mr. Disraeli's proposal touching the levying of the income-tax. What he described as the mode of levying the tax was the whole of the question. It was not an impracticable mode, and the heads of the revenue department fortified that statement. It was not unjust, for the House had as much right to tax six months' income as twelve months' income. If Mr. Disraeli's suggestion were adopted there would be a gap to be filled up, and to borrow 2,000,000*l.* would be as objectionable as to borrow 5,000,000*l.* They ought not to lay new burdens on 1860. Mr. Disraeli's doctrine was, that the growth of the peace expenditure was natural, legitimate, and normal. Mr. Gladstone utterly denied this. If every man's petition for expenditure in this and that was attended to, the finances would be in confusion in five years. The fact was that the spirit of economy was relaxed, and the one thing essential was to return to the temper and spirit which ruled with respect to the public expenditure chiefly from the period of the first Government of the Duke of Wellington. Mr. Gladstone mentioned a variety of claims on the Exchequer in prospect—harbours of refuge, public offices, National Gallery, contracts to the extent

of 600,000*l.* a year, more or less entertained by the late Government; and yet Mr. Disraeli spoke with calm satisfaction of the growth of the civil service estimates. Mr. Disraeli also took a sanguine view of the naval and military estimates. The magical results he predicted were not to be obtained, and still less by imitating the course of Lord Malmesbury. Admitting that Lord Malmesbury had acted in the spirit of an English gentleman and a lover of peace in recent transactions, Mr. Gladstone said he must be silent on everything beyond that admission. He advised the Opposition not to endeavour, by continual taunts, to leave the Government the only alternative of entering on an invidious task of dissection or appearing to assent to what was not compatible with their honest convictions. Admitting that we ought to preserve the French alliance and diminish our armaments as soon as the state of Europe would admit, Mr. Gladstone said he could go no further with Mr. Disraeli. Why this sweeping denunciation of Congresses by those, too, above all others, who were striving four months ago to bring about, by hook or by crook, the meeting of a Congress? Mr. Disraeli's doctrine, that peace never fulfilled the programme of war, was quite new. In the Russian war and the great revolutionary war the programme was fulfilled. He agreed that Government should strive to make peace permanent, but they must have the liberty to choose their own measures.

Mr. Bright gave a qualified approval of the financial measures of the Government. But

he strongly expressed his opinion that the income-tax should not be permanent until a distinction was drawn between permanent and precarious incomes. He also described the grievances inflicted on the trading and commercial community by the unequal operation of the succession-duties, and contended that probate should be levied equally upon all kinds of property. Commenting on the growth of our naval and military estimates, Mr. Bright, with great emphasis, ridiculed our periodical invasion panics, and censured those, whether editors or peers, who used irritating language towards France and the French Emperor. The admission of the Emperor that he was making war against the mind of Europe, and that he made peace because the war was assuming dimensions not consistent with the interests of France, proved that the suspicions of his future objects were unfounded. Mr. Bright earnestly wished that our Government would set the example of proposing a mutual reduction of armaments. The French believed we were making an outcry about invasion to cover designs of invading them! The Emperor had shown that he desired to ally himself with England. Then why generate suspicions and create alarms? Mr. Bright recommended the Government to emancipate itself from old, worthless, and bloody traditions, and to approach the French nation in a sensible and Christian spirit, and propose a reciprocal removal of duties that press upon trade. He hoped Lord Palmerston would do all he could to knit the two nations together.

Lord John Russell said he de-

sired to state how much he agreed with Mr. Bright. The attempts made in this country to induce a feeling of animosity to France and her Sovereign could only produce animosity against us; and animosity and anger had produced more wars than territorial disputes. The Emperor had been a faithful ally. On what, then, rested the declamation to induce the people of England to arm? Briefly touching other topics in a short speech, Lord John said that he would express no opinion as to the wisdom of taking part in a Congress; that the Emperor had done all he could in the way of free trade; and that it would be unwise and would give strength to the French Protectionists to enter into a correspondence with the French Government on the question of reciprocity.

Lord Palmerston said he could not hear in silence the erroneous statement of Mr. Disraeli that he had said that the Government had nothing better to do than to follow in the steps of the late Ministers. He had said no such thing. What he had said was, that he approved of the course pursued by the late Government, and was determined to pursue it because it was in accordance with the interests and the opinion of the country.

"I am so far," continued the noble lord, "from pronouncing unqualified approval of the foreign policy of the late Government, as that statement would imply, that I believe I gave offence to the late Government by condemning their foreign policy as regards the manner in which they endeavoured to prevent the war which broke out. That which I stated

repeatedly, and which I repeat now as my own individual conviction, is, that had the late Government employed the means which were in their power, and which I contend they ought to have employed, they might have prevented the rupture between France and Austria. That was my opinion; that is my opinion still. I have no doubt that they had the best intentions, and that to the extent of their ability they carried out their intentions. But I say that they failed, and they failed from not understanding and seeing in what direction their exertions ought to have been applied. I speak thus from what is known to all the world—from the language used by the Government in both Houses of Parliament as to the question at issue. It was encouraging to Austria. It was defiance to France. The whole meaning of the language of the late Government was this:—war is impending, and if it break out, England may be drawn into the contest, and the side with which she will be drawn into the contest will be the side of Austria. Their notion was that to prevent war they ought to threaten France. The result shows, that if they had taken the other line, and by firm and friendly advice dissuaded Austria from the course which she took, the war might have been prevented.” After commenting, like Mr. Gladstone, on the extraordinary doctrine of Mr. Disraeli that we should take no part in a Congress, and showing that our intervention had been beneficial in Greece, Belgium, Portugal, Spain, and the slave-trade, Lord Palmerston said, that when we spoke of the calamities

of the war in Italy, we must remember the miseries peace entailed on the Italians. “My noble friend stated that whether we should be parties to a Conference or not, was a matter still under consideration, and would depend upon circumstances. But, undoubtedly, no Government of this country would recommend that England should be a party to a Congress simply to register the edicts—simply to record the arrangements made by other parties, without the previous consent and concurrence of England. We may enter into a Conference for the purpose of improving arrangements not finally concluded and still open for consideration; but it is no part of England’s duty to make herself simply the recording agent of transactions in which she has had no part or voice.” Lord Palmerston added, “The Emperor of the French has been the faithful and true ally of England, both in times of peace and of war; and we have every reason to regard him as a monarch who feels personally, and upon system, desirous to cement and perpetuate the alliance which subsists between his country and our own. That such a feeling exists is, however, I admit, no good reason why we should not place ourselves in a state of defence. . . . There is nothing, therefore, I maintain, at all inconsistent with a desire upon our part that the alliance between England and France should endure, in our making every provision which may be deemed requisite for the purpose of placing this country in such a position as that she need be under no apprehension of being attacked by any neighbouring or more

powerful State. To take that course is, I feel assured, a policy not more becoming the dignity of the nation itself than it is in accordance with a sincere wish to maintain friendly relations with other Powers." Lord Palmerston concluded by saying, that in his opinion nothing was more inconsistent than to say that we are undefended, and to use language calculated to provoke and irritate the Power from which hostilities were apprehended. As to commercial relations, there was no difference between Mr. Bright and the Government in principle, but only as to the mode of accomplishing the end desired.

Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald made a few remarks in answer to Lord Palmerston, charging the Government with seeking to avoid a discussion on the foreign policy of the late ministers.

Mr. Gladstone having on the same evening moved a Resolution for granting an additional income-tax of 4*d.* in the pound, to be paid in the first six months of the ensuing year, Sir Henry Willoughby moved two amendments—the first, that the additional income-tax should be 3*d.* in the pound; the second, that the additional rate on the Long Annuities should be one farthing. Both were negatived without a division; and an amendment moved by Mr. Disraeli, for altering the Resolution as to the time of paying the additional income-tax, met with the same result.

The Bills for giving effect to the financial arrangements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, were afterwards passed with little debate or opposition.

The imperial finances of the year having been thus settled, those of India remained for consideration, and with this view Sir Charles Wood, the Secretary of State for India, on the 1st of August made his statement in the House of Commons. The Right Hon. Baronet commenced his speech with some prefatory observations on the serious importance of the questions to be submitted to the House. He spoke of the future with some anticipations of anxiety. But the prospect, discouraging as it was, was not hopeless. If we surmounted the difficulties of the next two or three years, he saw no reason why India should not recover the prosperity it enjoyed before the mutiny broke out. Premising that it was impossible to bring down the financial statement to a late period with precision, as the accounts since April, 1858, were only estimates, and that he should deal with the sums in round numbers, converting the rupee at the uniform rate of 2*s.*, he proceeded to state that on the 30th of April, 1857 (before the mutiny), the Indian debt amounted to 59,462,000*l.*, the interest to 2,525,000*l.* The military expenditure, ordinary and extraordinary, was 12,561,000*l.* In 1857–58, the general expenditure of India amounted to 40,226,000*l.*, the revenue to 31,706,000*l.*, the deficiency of revenue being 8,520,000*l.* In 1858–59, the expenditure was 48,500,000*l.*; the revenue 33,800,000*l.*, leaving a deficiency of 14,700,000*l.* The total deficiency to be provided for in the two years amounted, therefore, to 23,220,000*l.* The sums borrowed in India in 1857–58 and 1858–59, amounted to 10,556,000*l.*, and

in England to 11,562,000*l.*, making together 22,118,000*l.*, the difference of 1,102,000*l.* being made up by the diminution of balances. This was the state of things up to the 30th of April last. The debt of India, there and in England, was 81,580,000*l.*, the interest being 8,564,000*l.* The military expenditure in the year ending the 30th of April last, was 25,849,000*l.* The expenditure on India for the year 1859-60, was estimated at 38,380,000*l.*, the charge at home at 5,851,500*l.*, the interest on railway capital he took at 900,000*l.* and the compensation for losses in India at 1,000,000*l.*, making the total estimated charge 46,131,500*l.* The revenue for the same year was estimated at 35,850,000*l.*, including the additional taxes; deducting this sum from 46,131,500*l.* and adding to the deficiency 2,000,000*l.* on account of further demands, there would remain 12,500,000*l.* to be provided for. The loans in India had produced much less than had been expected, but he hoped to receive in India 2,000,000*l.*, and this, added to 4,800,000*l.*, the produce of the 5,000,000*l.* of debentures issued under the authority given by Parliament to raise 7,000,000*l.* (making together 6,800,000*l.*), still left 5,700,000*l.* to be provided for to make up the 12,500,000*l.*, and he proposed to take power to borrow 5,000,000*l.* in addition to the 2,000,000*l.* under the former power, it being necessary that he should have a margin of 7,000,000*l.* in order to meet the expenses of the year. At the end of 1860, the Indian debt would be 95,836,000*l.*, and the interest upon the debt 3,900,000*l.* In the course of the year 1860-61, it

would be unnecessary to provide a sum for compensation for losses; on the other hand, the interest on the debt would have increased, so that he could not take the expenditure of that year at less than 46,000,000*l.*, and the revenue he took at 36,000,000*l.*, which left a deficiency of 10,000,000*l.* How the expenditure and the receipts could be balanced was an embarrassing question; it must be effected either by a reduction of the former, or an addition to the latter. The reduction of expenditure depended upon the state of India. The first item of expenditure was the Civil establishments, and he should deceive the House, he said, if he held out a hope of any considerable reduction in this item. He did not think it just or fair to reduce the salaries of civil servants now in office, though a reduction might be made on new appointments, but, considering the demand for European supervision, he did not think there could be a material diminution of the civil expenditure. The next item was Public Works, and some saving might be made in this item, though not large, and some reductions might be made in the home expenditure. But the great item in which a saving might be effected was the military expenditure. The whole military force in India, including depôts at home, Europeans, natives, and military police, at the present time consisted of 431,600 men. It was clear, he thought, that we must maintain a larger European force than we had hitherto done. It was clear, too, that the mutiny had been almost entirely a military mutiny, prompted by religious feelings,

the native population, generally speaking (except in Oude), having taken little or no part in it. From this fact we might learn, he observed, two things—first, that we should carefully avoid giving the natives any reason to believe that there was a design to attack their religious prejudices; secondly, that we ought not to maintain so large a native force as before. The question as to the amount of force required in India was a very difficult one. The military expenditure before the mutiny being 12,000,000*l.* and the present expenditure 21,000,000*l.*, the difference being 9,000,000*l.*, there was room for a very large reduction upon this item of expenditure, and he thought the reduction might extend to 3,000,000*l.* or 4,000,000*l.* It was impossible, however, to say how soon this reduction could take place, but the utmost care would be taken to keep down this branch of the expenditure. With regard to the augmentation of the revenue, authority had been sent to the Government of India to raise the salt duty in Madras, Bombay, and the North-west Provinces, and to impose stamp duties and a tax upon licenses; and possibly a succession duty. He could not, of course, form an estimate of the probable amount which these duties would produce; but when all was done that we could hope to do, there must still be for a year or two a considerable deficiency that must be supplied, and 5,000,000*l.* or 6,000,000*l.* would have to be provided by Parliament. It was the intention of the Government to select a person versed in finance to be sent to India, to take the revenue

and financial department under his charge. In conclusion, he showed that there had been a progressive improvement in the revenues of India, and declared he by no means despaired of its future. He moved a Resolution enabling the Government to raise in the United Kingdom for the service of the Government of India 5,000,000*l.*, to meet the demands of the present year.

Mr. Crawford observed that Sir Charles Wood had not explained the mode in which he proposed to raise the 5,000,000*l.* If by debentures, he would fail; the debenture market—he said it with confidence—would be overstocked.

The principal speakers in the debate which followed were Lord Stanley and Mr. Bright. The former entered at some length into an explanation of his views on Indian finances. The sources of difficulty, he said, were temporary; the deficit must be diminished by one of three modes—by taxation, or some measure to obtain relief beyond the limits of India, or by a reduction in expenditure. He went over the various taxes which had been proposed for India, such as the succession tax, and the tobacco tax, and licenses on trade, to show that we could not expect much more than we now obtain from taxation. The next question was, whether any relief could be obtained from any quarter beyond India itself. Under this head he treated of the experiment of an imperial guarantee, set forth the arguments for and against it, and arrived at the conclusion that something in the nature of imperial assistance would become before long a matter of absolute

necessity. He did not look for a retrospective guarantee, but such assistance as would satisfy present exigencies and cease when those exigencies ceased. He pointed out that whereas we pay nearly all the military expenditure of the colonies, we throw all the military expenditure upon India, and he thought that we should borrow something from the system we pursued with regard to the colonies. Then came the question of the reduction of Indian expenditure. Lord Stanley was of opinion that little could be done in the way of reduction in the Civil expenditure, and if that little were done it would be a question whether the saving effected would compensate for the discontent which would be created. He did not concur in the opinion that the number of Europeans employed in the Civil Service should be increased, and thought rather that a larger number of natives—especially educated natives—should be admitted into the Indian Civil Service, and that the uncovenanted servants should be admitted to offices that were held by the covenanted servants. Some saving might be effected by a re-organization of the Governor-General's Council, if it were composed of persons who were actually heads of the principal departments. Looking to the future, he thought that the railways would become self-supporting and afford a larger amount than was sufficient to cover the guarantee. As regards the question of military expenditure, we should not be able for some time to return to the old standard of our military force in India. Looking to the whole question he did not think that it would be safe in

VOL. CI.

any case to reduce the European force hereafter to be retained in India below 60,000 or 65,000, and he was of opinion that two-thirds of the European force maintained in India should be troops exclusively for Indian service.

Mr. Bright entered at still greater length into an exposition of his opinions as to the prospects of India, her financial affairs, and the administration of the civil and military departments. He took a gloomy view of the destinies of that country. To him the danger seemed every year to increase in magnitude, and having paid some attention to the subject, he desired to take his share in confronting the evil. Sir Charles Wood had said that everything was satisfactory in 1855. Well, in that year it did happen that the deficit was 143,000*l.* only. But it gave a better idea of the case to note that in the three years preceding the mutiny, the deficit was 2,823,000*l.* It must be a bad Government that did not defray its expenses out of the taxes. Yet in India millions were levied on the sale and transit of opium, by a process which was not taxation. That was in danger of being impaired, or suddenly cut off altogether. Next year the debt would be 100,000,000*l.* That the money could be borrowed at all, even at a high rate of interest, only arose from the fact that England contrived to scramble through her difficulties and keep good faith. As to an Imperial guarantee, he did not oppose it from sympathy with the English tax-payers, but because if we let "the service of India" put its hand into the pockets of the

[M]

English people, it was impossible to foresee to what lengths of unimagined extravagance it would go. At this moment the military expenditure absorbed the net revenue, and not a farthing was left to pay the public creditor. Either the Government of India must come to an end, or England must become tributary to India. Mr. Bright went on to denounce the policy of annexation with great emphasis; to declare that the Civil Service was overpaid; that it did not deserve the praises heaped upon it; to propose that the income of the Civil Service should be reduced one-half, and to argue against maintaining an European or a native army larger than was absolutely required. If, he said, we were to have one body of troops to watch another, there could be no hope of any diminution of expenditure. The mutiny was suppressed by 45,000 men; the people of Oude had been disarmed. There was no power in India for armed resistance except the Native army, which had been built up of late to a greater extent than ever. He decried the authority of military men on the question of the force that should be maintained, and showed that if so large an European force were kept, the supremacy of the conquering race would be displayed in an offensive manner. That was not so when the English were weak in India. Then the natives were treated with respect. "A Government, then, with this vast army, must always be in a difficulty. Neither Lord Canning nor Lord anybody else can turn his attention to anything but this wearing, exasperating question of how money is to be got to pay this army. He cannot turn his at-

tention in any way to reforms, and I am convinced that this House must insist upon the Government reducing the large amount of its army, whatever be the risk. A large army will render it impossible for you to hold the country, for you will have a constantly increasing debt, and anarchy must inevitably overwhelm you in the end. A small army, a moderate, conciliatory, and just Government, with the finances in a prosperous condition, and I know not but for generations and centuries this country may possess a share, and a large share, in the government of those vast territories which it has conquered." Mr. Bright maintained that there was no government in India. There was no independent English opinion; the Civil Service was privileged, arrogant, tyrannous. The Governor-General was the creature of the services. Procrastination was the very nature of the Government. Lord Stanley had condemned the annexation of Dhar. No notice has been taken of his letter. Sir Charles Trevelyan at Madras had shown a spirit above that of a passive instrument, and had sought to introduce beneficial changes. He had therefore raised a hornet's nest about him. Mr. Bright drew a sarcastic picture of the helpless position of a Governor-General condemned to breathe official air, and live in an official circle, overwhelmed by his duties; and dwelt on the perpetual changes going on in the appointments of magistrates, mentioning cases where one man filled twenty-four situations in thirteen years; another twenty-one offices in twenty-one years, and so on. Finally, he expatiated

at great length on his own remedy for India—the decentralization of the Government, pointing to Ceylon, where there was some kind of representation of public opinion, and recommending electoral councils for Bombay and Madras. At present all the governors of provinces were in fetters, and Sir Charles Trevelyan had been blamed for attempting to break through them. “I am convinced,” continued Mr. Bright, “that you will not make a single step towards the improvement of India unless you change your whole system of government—unless you give to each Presidency a government with more independent powers than are now possessed by them. What would be thought if the whole of Europe was under one governor, who knew only the language of the Feejee Islands, and if his subordinates were like himself, only more intelligent than the inhabitants of the Feejee Islands are supposed to be? You set a governor over nearly 200,000,000 of human beings, in a climate where the European cannot do the work he has to do so well as here—where neither the moral nor physical strength of the individual is equal to what it is at home—and you do not even always furnish the most powerful men for the office; you seem to think that the atmosphere will be always calm and the sea always smooth—and so the government of India goes on; there are promises without number of beneficial changes, but we never hear that India is much better or worse than before. Now, that is not the way to do justice to a great empire like India. What is now going on in India

among our own troops? Notwithstanding what we have heard, that the Government is not disposed to take a gloomy view of things, who can tell what intelligence another mail may bring us? Let us not forget the condition in which India now is. Her native governments have been cast to the ground, and the princes who reigned there are wanderers on the soil they once called their own, pensioners on the bounty of the strangers by whom their fortunes have been overturned. Thousands of the people helpless and friendless, deprived of their natural leaders and their chiefs, are spread over the land, looking still, I trust, with hope to the justice and clemency of their conquerors. I appeal to your mercy and justice on behalf of that people. For years past I have never spoken but with the same earnestness as now in their behalf; and I ask if it is not possible to touch a chord in the hearts of Englishmen that will raise them to a sense of the duty they owe to the people of India? If this state of things exists in India it must ere long become a serious burden to the people of this country. You will show to the world that, though you can conquer, you have not the ability to govern. You had better disencumber yourselves of the fatal gift of empire if it leads you as conquerors to neglect the duties you owe as governors. I hope it will never be said that the time had come when the arms of England were irresistible in India, but that India was avenged, inasmuch as she broke the power of England by the intolerable evils she imposed upon her, the vast amount of men and money re-

[M 2]

quired to keep India in subjection being a burden she was unable to bear."

Mr. T. G. Baring briefly replied to Mr. Bright. With respect to his scheme for improving Indian administration, he was of opinion that the whole control of the government of India should rest with the Governor-General; but he admitted that there would be a great saving of time in not fettering the governors of the minor presidencies in matters of detail.

Mr. H. Digby Seymour complained of the apathy of the Central Government of India, which was unable to attend at Calcutta to all the details sent to them. The military force required in India, he agreed with Mr. Bright, depended upon the principles on which it was to be governed. The proposed taxes were, in his opinion, open to great objection, especially the salt-tax. He suggested other modes of raising revenue.

Mr. Vansittart desired to see more civil functionaries, and the settlement of more Europeans in India. Mr. Gregson spoke against, and Mr. Kinnard and Mr. Coningham in favour of an Imperial guarantee. Mr. Hankey deprecated the middle course taken by the Government.

The formal resolutions submitted to the House were agreed to.

A discussion as to the best mode of raising money in this country for the service of India, was raised upon one of the stages of the East India Loan Bill as it passed through the House of Commons. Mr. Crauford took occasion to express his objection to the principle of an Imperial

guarantee, but he suggested that Parliament might borrow the money in England for Indian purposes, and lend it again to India, taking some adequate security. Mr. Vansittart and Mr. Ayrton advocated an Imperial guarantee. They argued that we were wasting 10,000,000*l.* a-year to maintain abstract principles of political economy. Col. Sykes advocated the same views. Sir Edward Colebrooke and Sir Henry Willoughby asked for information touching the intentions of the Government in sending out Mr. James Wilson to act as the Financial Minister in India, and expressed doubts as to the expediency of that step. Nothing, they said, could be more dangerous than to set up a department in opposition to the Governor-General.

Sir Charles Wood said that Mr. Wilson had not yet accepted office, but he hoped he would do so. The financial responsibility would, however, still rest on the Governor-General, just as in England it rested on the Cabinet. Mr. Wilson, or whoever might be appointed to the office contemplated, would be merely a member of the Governor-General's Council, charged with the department of finance.

The Bill for authorising the loan to India having passed the Commons, was introduced into the House of Lords on the 11th of August, by the Duke of Argyll, who made a statement respecting the condition of Indian finance similar to that given in the other House by Sir Charles Wood. The Duke, however, took a rather more cheerful view of the prospects of India. He thought that the principal field for retrench-

ment was in the military expenditure. There was now no native power to give us uneasiness: not a gun could be cast without our consent; a native army was useless without artillery, and our relative superiority to the natives had much increased.

The Earl of Ellenborough took strong objections to the practice of giving guarantees to railway companies, which, he said, prevented the Government from borrowing at a lower rate than the rate of the guarantee. He approved of the measure adopted by the Government of sending out Mr. Wilson to act as Chancellor of the Exchequer of India. With assistance, that gentleman might reduce the accounts to an intelligible shape; but he must be supported from home, because he would have to teach, not only habits of business, but habits of obedience. Lord Ellenborough objected to the reduction of the civil salaries, and thought that at no distant period we might reduce our military establishments. He would bring down the number of Native troops to the level of the European troops. He strongly objected to those who proposed that we should abandon India.

Lord Lyveden agreed that there was no cause for despondency. He could not hear talk of abandoning India without a certain amount of shame. With regard to the financial question, he thought that both the civil and military expenditure could be reduced. He also thought that that gigantic job—the Indian Council—should be reduced to six members, who should be the heads of departments; but the greatest saving must be effected

in military expenditure. Lord Ellenborough had spoken of Mr. Wilson as a Chancellor of the Exchequer; he had never understood that Mr. Wilson was to act in such a capacity. If he had the powers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it would involve a great interference with the Government of India. He hoped that Mr. Wilson would be armed with sufficient authority, and so backed from home, that the country would obtain the advantage of his services.

The Loan Bill passed through the House, and received the Royal Assent.

It may be convenient to notice in this connection, a Bill introduced towards the end of the Session by Sir Charles Wood, to fix the limits of the European troops in India. Its object and nature were explained by the right honourable Baronet. In 1853, he said, the number of Company's troops was increased from 12,200 to 20,000, and the number training in England from 2000 to 4000. It was a legal question whether the Act meant that the Company could employ 20,000 or 24,000. The late Government had sanctioned an establishment of 25,500, and the Bill was necessary to cover anything that had been done which might be illegal. The Bill limited the number to 30,000. It did not follow that the whole of this number would be raised, but it could not be exceeded. With regard to the employment of a local European force in India, Sir Charles Wood expressed a strong opinion, remarking that the weight of authority was in favour of such a force. The late Lord Hardinge, Sir John Law-

rence, the late Government and the present Government, had alike come to that conclusion. It would be far more expensive to maintain a force entirely composed of Queen's troops, than a force composed of Queen's and local troops. With regard to the mutiny of the local troops at present in India, he said, he thought the men had no substantial grievance, but that a great deal was to be said in justification of their view. He looked upon it rather as a strike than as a mutiny; they ought not to be dealt with as mutineers; and he thought that Lord Canning, after having had accorded to him the fullest authority to deal with the question as he thought fit, had acted for the best in giving the men the option of a discharge. The Bill did not prejudice any of the questions connected with the subject of our Indian forces, which were left open for future consideration.

General Peel made some strong remarks on the conduct of the local European force, and said that an army in which such discipline existed was not to be trusted. He seemed to be entirely opposed to any local European force whatever, considering that it would interfere with the recruiting of the Queen's troops in England. He suggested that the limit of 3 per cent. of foreigners, now allowed to enter the British army, should be extended. The

question of a local army was neither more nor less than a question of patronage, and he thought it would be better to do without the Indian Council than leave them any patronage at all.

Sir de Lacy Evans objected altogether to recruiting foreigners. He would not call the insubordination of the local troops a mutiny; and he considered that a local army was indispensable to India. Mr. Sidney Herbert pointed out that General Peel, as a member of the Commission, had pronounced against a local army, while, as a member of the late Government, he had decided in-favour of it. Colonel North complained of the mismanagement of the local troops in India, and of the withholding of batta from those troops who served in Persia. Sir Frederick Smith looked upon the maintenance of a local European force in India as a necessity; and as regarded the insubordination of the local troops, he could not call that a mutiny, when the men had so strong a case. Colonel Sykes expressed a decided opinion in favour of a local force. Sir Henry Willoughby thought that the House of Commons should bear some share of blame for the late mutiny, because they had not made the transfer of service clear to the men. Several other members expressed their opinions on the measure, which was eventually passed.

CHAPTER VI.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS. THE WAR IN ITALY—Statement made by Earl Granville on the re-assembling of Parliament—Remarks of the Duke of Rutland, Earl of Malmesbury, and the Duke of Newcastle—Lord Palmerston intimates in the House of Commons the views of the Government on the Italian Question—The news of the Armistice between France and Austria arrives in England, and is communicated to both Houses, then sitting, by the Ministers—Further discussions in the House of Lords on the events passing in Italy—Opinions expressed by the Earl of Malmesbury, Marquis of Normanby, Earl Granville, Earl of Derby, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and other Peers. In the House of Commons, Lord Elcho postpones a motion on the affairs of Italy, of which he had given notice—Remarks made on the occasion by Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald and Lord John Russell—On the 28th of July, pursuant to notice, Lord John Russell enters into a lengthened explanation of the policy of the Government in regard to Italian affairs—His speech—Answer of Mr. Disraeli—Speeches of Mr. Bowyer, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Drummond, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Maquire, and Lord Claude Hamilton—Further debates in both Houses on the same subject—The Marquis of Normanby raises the question of Italian policy by a motion for papers—Answer of Lord Wodehouse—Lord Elcho renews in the House of Commons his postponed motion for an Address to the Crown respecting the proposed Conference of European Powers—Mr. Kinglake moves the Previous Question—Speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, Lord Harry Vane, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Milnes, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Whiteside, Lord John Russell, Mr. Disraeli, and Lord Palmerston—Lord Elcho replies, and declines to press his motion, which is not put—The Estimates having been voted, and various necessary Bills passed, the Session is brought to a close on the 18th of August—Parliament is prorogued by Commission—The Speech from the Throne delivered by the Lord Chancellor—Concluding Remarks.

THE events which took place on the theatre of war in Italy, of which an account is given in another part of this Volume, gave rise to occasional remarks and discussions in the two Houses of Parliament, on their re-assembling after the General Election. Both the foreign policy of Lord Derby's Go-

vernment and the principles adopted by their successors in office, came in for their share of animadversion and comment. It will be necessary briefly to notice some of these debates, in which the course pursued by the British Government in regard to France and Italy underwent the criticism of Parliament. In the first Ministerial explanations given to the House of Lords by Earl Granville, as the leader of the House, that noble lord made some remarks upon the duty of the Government in respect of the war then pending, and our foreign relations in general, which gave occasion to a short debate. In touching on the subject of the National Defences, Lord Granville said that the Ministers were fully alive to the duty of efficiently maintaining them. There was no ground, he said, for alarm of invasion, but invasion should be an impossibility. The war would engage the first and most serious attention of the Government. It was our duty to maintain a strict and *bonâ fide* neutrality, to keep our country at peace, and to give Europe peace as soon as possible, by bringing our influence to bear at the first favourable moment. That course, he believed, would be supported by the House.

The Duke of Rutland contended that the speeches of those Ministers who attributed the war to Austria, were not in keeping with the declaration of neutrality. Sardinia was the cause of the war. England ought to be prepared for every eventuality. The French Emperor could not restrain the passions of his army, and no one could say what might happen.

The Earl of Malmesbury made a speech, mainly intended to refute the criticisms of members of the present Government when they led the Opposition. His object was to show from the pages of the blue-book, that he had done all he could to induce France and Austria to come to an understanding. He had not, as Lord Palmerston said, patronized Austria. He had anticipated the advice of that noble lord, and had told Austria that nothing should induce the English Government to support her in Lombardy against her own subjects. He had told her that England would stand by her in maintaining her treaty rights, but not in exercising improper administrative and military influence. He had recommended a Congress. He had not passed the bounds of neutrality. But if it were true, as stated by Sir Charles Wood at Halifax, that the Government had given advice to Germany, then they had gone further than the late Government, and had taken the first step towards leaving a position of neutrality, since they had advised Germany not to judge for herself.

The Duke of Newcastle deprecated premature discussion. The words imputed to Sir Charles Wood were probably inaccurate, for the despatch did not bear the construction put upon it. The Duke assured the Duke of Rutland, that the Cabinet were unanimous in the intention to maintain a strict neutrality.

Lord Howden spoke of the war as "iniquitous." He had at heart the real independence of Italy, and protested loudly against the unholy means taken to obtain a righteous end. The end did

not sanctify the means. The determination of France was taken long before the month of February, but, still, when he heard Italy claiming the Emperor Napoleon as its liberator and regenerator, he could not help saying that he had great doubts whether, at the bottom of his very capacious mind, his Majesty ever intended or expected the real liberation of Italy, however large or magnificent might be the device which he had inscribed upon his banner. Little or no change would be allowed to take place in Rome and the Papal States, and the so-called liberation of a part of Northern Italy would only serve to plunge those magnificent regions, if not into deeper darkness, at least into deeper disappointment and despair.

The discussion then dropped.

In the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston, on the same day, took occasion to lay down the principles by which his Government would be guided in their transactions with foreign countries. The noble lord said:—"There are two great questions which pre-eminently occupy the attention of the public; one, the state of our foreign relations as connected with those important events which are now passing in the South of Europe; the other, that question of the amendment of the laws regarding the representation of the people in Parliament, which has so recently and anxiously engaged the attention of Parliament and of the country. The course which we intend to pursue with regard to that first great question, is the course which has been chalked

out for us by those who preceded us,—that is, a strict neutrality in the contest which is now waging. I trust that nothing can occur which should involve this country in hostilities, which, as far as human foresight can go, seem to turn upon matters which, though interesting the sympathies one way or the other of the people of this country, are yet so remote from their direct interests that it would, I think, be unpardonable in any Government to endeavour to involve this country in the contest. It will be our duty, as no doubt it would have been felt to be the duty of the late Government, to avail ourselves of any favourable opportunity which may occur in the course of these events, to tender the good offices of England, either separately or conjointly with other Powers, for the purpose of restoring to Europe the blessings of peace; but I am sure that this House will feel that steps of that kind ought not to be lightly taken, that a great country like this ought not to tender advice or interpose offices until it sees that the march of events renders it likely that those good offices or that advice will be acceptable to those to whom they are tendered, and that lightly and without sufficient consideration to commit the country to steps of that sort would be derogatory to the dignity of the nation, and useless with regard to any good which might be anticipated from the adoption of such a course."

The unexpected news of the conclusion of a peace between France and Italy, surprised the two Houses during their sitting

on the 12th of July.—Lord Wodehouse immediately communicated to the House of Lords a telegram he had just received from the English Ambassador at Paris, which had been sent by the Emperor of the French to the Empress, dated Valleggio, July 11th, and was in the following terms: "Peace is signed between the Emperor of Austria and me. The bases of peace are—Italian Confederation under the honorary presidency of the Pope; the Emperor of Austria cedes his rights to Lombardy to me, and I transfer them to the King of Sardinia; the Emperor of Austria preserves Venetia, which is an integral part of the Italian Confederation."

Lord John Russell made a similar communication to the House of Commons, with an important addition, viz., with reference to a rumour that the Emperor would require that Savoy should be ceded to him by Sardinia; he stated that the Emperor had made no such demand, and that he did not ask for any addition whatever to his dominions.

On the 13th, Earl Granville made an appeal to Lord Malmesbury, who had given notice of a motion having reference to the affairs of Northern Italy, that he would not then bring on his motion, on account of the public inconvenience that might result from it. He also asked the Marquis of Normanby, who had intended to move for the production of a despatch, to abstain from making any remarks likely to excite debate. The despatch Lord Granville undertook to produce.

Lord Malmesbury, after the

request Lord Granville had made, consented to postpone his motion. Although he agreed to defer his explanation on the despatch of Count Cavour, he could not forbear from referring to the case of the Duchess of Parma, whose admirable conduct had won universal admiration, and expressed his opinion that it would be a bad example of public morality if she were not restored to her dominion. He protested against the statements of Count Cavour, which he was ready, as he said, to meet and to refute one by one, but at the present moment he would not discuss the subject. Deprecating the opinion which prevailed in Her Majesty's Government, that it was necessary for the House to preserve silence on foreign affairs until their immediate interest had passed away, he sincerely hoped that Parliament would not separate before an opportunity had been given to the House to express their opinion on foreign affairs, and to learn the intention of the Government in regard to the position this country would occupy in concluding peace.

Lord Normanby, in acceding to the request of Lord Granville, postponed his observations on Count Cavour's despatch, which, he said, was characterized by a *suppressio veri*. He highly eulogized the conduct of the Duchess of Parma, who had done everything to promote the interests of her subjects, and whose States ought to be restored, as they had been guaranteed to her by the whole of Europe.

Lord Granville thanked the noble lords for the course they had taken. He explained that

there was no wish on the part of the Government to prevent discussion on foreign affairs. Cases, however, like the present might arise, when, from insufficient information, the House was incapable of arriving at just conclusions.

The Marquis of Clanricarde protested against the reserve which was maintained by Government in respect to foreign affairs.

Lord Brougham thought it a most melancholy thing that questions of so much importance as peace and war should be decided by two Emperors, uncontrolled by a Parliament, a press, or even in the slightest degree by their own Ministers.

Lord Derby thought it strange that Sardinia, which had occupied the first position, and to whom France had only stood in the relation of an ally, had been thrown entirely into the back-ground. They had heard that peace had been concluded between France and Austria: he wished to know whether peace had been agreed to between Austria and Sardinia.

Lord Granville said that the Government only knew that a convention had been drawn up between the French and Austrian Emperors as a basis for peace. He was not able to give further information.

The Marquis of Normanby then moved for a copy of a despatch from Lord John Russell to Mr. James Hudson, on the subject of the alleged annexation of the Duchies of Central Italy by the Government of Piedmont.

Lord Ebury protested against our past policy of officious interference in the affairs of foreign States, as tending to destroy the influence of this country in the councils of Europe. He hoped,

under the present circumstances, that Her Majesty's Government would not be too ready to put themselves forward, but would wait until their opinions and advice were asked for.

The Duke of Rutland said, that although he agreed with the last speaker on the policy of non-intervention, he did not concur with him in regard to Count Cavour, who, in his opinion, had been the principal cause of the war.

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe thought the objection made against British interference with foreign States, was more on account of the manner of doing it than of the thing itself, and he cited the case of the late King of Naples as in point. He also censured the conduct of Count Cavour, as having excited the revolutionary party in Tuscany.

Lord Wodehouse declared the willingness of the Government to discuss these matters fully, as soon as sufficient information had been obtained. He promised that Lord John Russell's despatch should be produced. He could not undertake to lay before the House the circulars moved for by Lord Malmesbury, but the answer to them should be communicated to their Lordships.

The Earl of Malmesbury thought the answer would not be intelligible without the circular.—The discussion then terminated.

In the House of Commons on the same evening, Lord Elcho, who had given notice of a motion respecting the affairs of Italy, which he then proposed to withdraw, entered into an explanation of the motives which had induced him to put the notice upon the

paper in the 'first instance, and subsequently to withdraw it. The noble lord indulged in some sarcastic comments upon the position in which the present state of political affairs in Italy placed Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell.

Mr. S. Fitzgerald observed that, although he thought Lord Elcho was not called upon to withdraw his motion, it was evident the discussion of it would be singularly inconvenient to the present Government, and especially unpalatable (for reasons he stated) to Lord Palmerston. He should, however, he said, follow the example of Lord Elcho, by not entering at length into the discussion of these matters. He would only say that the result should suggest a caution to those who depreciated a policy in utter ignorance of the facts, and to the present Ministry, who were called upon to accept with humility a policy they had reviled. After adverting to certain sentiments uttered and advice given by members of the Government now in power, he expressed a hope that they would avoid a system of interference which would impede the success of our diplomacy.

Lord John Russell, after replying briefly to Lord Elcho, said he was glad it was not necessary to discuss the conduct of the late Government, which, he admitted, had used its utmost endeavours to prevent the evils of war. If it had been necessary to go into all the particulars of their conduct, there might be certain parts of it in which they had not taken the view which he thought was most likely to lead to a satisfactory result. In the

present state of affairs, the influence of England should be employed to confirm and improve the general peace. Our policy was not to abandon a neutral position; that, he believed, had been the universal opinion of the people of this country. If we were called upon to consider a treaty of peace, we were bound not to participate in any treaty not conformable to our notions of the honour, the dignity, and the freedom of this country.

On the 28th of July, Lord John Russell, pursuant to notice, made an important statement in the House of Commons, respecting the condition of foreign affairs and the policy intended to be pursued by Her Majesty's Government. He could have wished, he said, to postpone this statement until some definite settlement had been arrived at; but in the present position of affairs, he did not think it right to withhold the statement from Parliament. He was glad to find in the *Moniteur* of that day, an announcement that the Emperor of the French was about to place his forces by sea and land upon a peace footing. After adverting to the sudden and unexpected termination of hostilities in Italy, and to the motives avowed by the Sovereigns of France and Austria for the Treaty of Villafranca, he observed that, although the reasons assigned by both had a certain validity, he believed that there was a reason not assigned in any State paper which had considerable weight with the two Emperors—namely, the numbers that had fallen upon the field of battle,—and it was no disparagement to either, to suppose them influenced by such a terrible

spectacle. The Treaty of Villafranca consisted of two parts. By one part peace was made between the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Austria, and Lombardy was ceded to the former, to be delivered over to the King of Sardinia. With regard to this matter, it was not for us, who had taken no part in the war, or the other Powers of Europe to interfere. But the other part of the treaty was of a different nature. It proposed an organization for the liberation of Italy. In 1856, Lord Clarendon, being at the Conference of Paris, met to deliberate upon the peace concluded between Great Britain and France on the one hand, and Russia on the other, thought it his duty, in conjunction with the representative of France, to bring before the Conference the state of Italy, which, being a question affecting the peace of Europe, was a fair matter for consideration. The proposition made to us on the present occasion, on the part of France, was not that the Government of Great Britain should enter into a Congress to discuss the Treaty of Villafranca, and he read an extract from a despatch from Count Walewski, explaining the objects of the meeting of the Plenipotentiaries at Zurich—viz., to confer upon general questions, not the details of the treaty of peace. Her Majesty's Government, he said, had not thought it necessary to give any precise answer to the proposition of the French Government; but they had signified to our Ambassador at Paris that, if there was to be any Conference or Congress, two things were requisite—first, that the Treaty of Zurich should be

seen; secondly, that the Emperor of Austria must be a party to any discussion on the state of Italy. The first question raised would relate to a Confederation. The article of the treaty did not say that the Confederation was formed or should be formed, but only that the two Sovereigns would favour and further a Confederation. If the several States could form a federal union, Italy would, in his opinion, be strong enough for its own defence, and there would be no necessity for the intervention of foreign Powers. He thought, therefore, that such a Confederation would be wise, but he doubted whether the time had yet come when it was practicable, and whether a Confederation with the Pope as chief, and the Emperor of Austria as one of its members, would be desirable. How could such a Confederation lay down rules of conduct, or be expected to assent to religious toleration and liberty of conscience? Therefore, although an Italian Confederation might in time be practicable, the Peace of Villafranca hardly fulfilled the conditions required for forming such a federal union. Then arose another question, as to the mode in which the treaty was to be carried into effect; and it would be necessary to have a complete understanding upon that point before Her Majesty's Government should send any representative to a Congress or Conference. According to the treaty, the Sovereigns of Tuscany and Modena were to return to their States. But the Grand Duke of Tuscany was in the position of a sovereign who had violated, by abdication, the fundamental law of his State. Although he (Lord

John) had no official assurance upon the subject, he was convinced that the Emperor of the French had no intention to employ French troops for the restoration of the Grand Duke, and he believed that the Emperor of Austria had as little intention to lend his troops for such a purpose. This threw at once a great difficulty in the way of carrying the treaty into effect, and it was necessary, before going into conference, that there should be a clear understanding upon this subject. Another question was, perhaps, the most difficult of all—namely, the temporal government of the Pope. Bologna had been kept in obedience for ten years by an Austrian garrison, and as soon as the Austrian troops left, the Cardinal Legate immediately followed them. The Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Austria had recommended to the Pope indispensable reforms, but the Pope declined to adopt the policy they advised. These were some of the difficulties attending this question. As to the King of Naples, he was happy to say that he had made a good beginning, in putting a stop to the tyrannical system which prevailed under the late King; and he believed, from the decided views of his Minister, the Duke of Satriano, that it would cease altogether. In conclusion, Lord John Russell said, "We find ourselves in this position. A treaty is about to be made at Zurich. A confidential agent of the French Government has been sent to Vienna, in order to settle with the Emperor of Austria what the bases of the treaty shall be. So far as I can learn, the Emperor of the French

is most anxious that the treaty should enable the Italians to enjoy the privilege of self-government. Now, whether they enjoy that privilege under one sovereign or under another, whether there is to be a Confederation, or whether there are to be two or three powerful States in Italy, I am convinced—and Her Majesty's Government are convinced—that an independent State or States in Italy would be for the welfare of Europe. I cannot say—it is impossible at the present moment to say—that there will be any Congress or Conference on this question. This, however, I may state with the utmost confidence, that it would not be wise on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and still less wise on the part of the House, to come to any permanent and absolute decision on the subject. It would never do for a Minister of the Crown of Great Britain to say that this country, which has taken part in all the great concerns of Europe since 1815—in the formation of the kingdom of Greece—in the formation of the kingdom of Belgium—should now suddenly and without any reason, withdraw from any such meeting or assembly of the Powers of Europe, if there be any chance that the situation of Italy might be improved, that peace might be confirmed, and the independence of the Italian States secured by our taking such a course. . . . The Emperor of the French has always said, and I think truly, that Italy has been a source of danger, and was in peril of revolution, but that that danger could not be completely averted, or

revolution finally stayed, unless the Powers of Europe generally were consenting parties to a settlement to which the people of Italy would give their assent, and which would recommend itself to the minds of reasonable and just men in all parts of the world. Such being the difficulties which impede our taking part in any such Conference, I may be permitted to say, in spite of Mr. Disraeli's sarcasms, that if Italy could be made prosperous, and her sons afforded a fair scope for the exercise of their talent and their energy, so that they might be enabled to take their part among the nations of Europe as contributing their quota—and I feel assured a rich quota it would be—to the progress of that great European family to which they belong—if such an object could be attained, then, Sir, I, for one, should not hesitate to declare that Her Majesty's Government would rejoice at its consummation."

Mr. Disraeli said that Lord John Russell's explanation respecting the terms supposed to be offered to the Emperor of Austria was ambiguous. He inquired whether certain terms, more severe than those he had accepted, were not laid before the Emperor of Austria.

"It has reached me," said the right honourable gentleman, "that the scheme for the settlement of hostilities which the Emperor of Austria, comparing it with the terms offered by his enemy, found so repugnant to his feelings and interests was brought to his cognizance through the influence and agency of Her Majesty's Government. If so, although it might be said that Ministers

offered no opinion on it, they gave a kind of sanction to it by making themselves the organs of communication. They have, in fact, committed the mistake they made in 1848, when the proposal now made by France and accepted by Austria, was made by Austria herself. We then repudiated the Austrian proposition, and now those very terms have been accepted from the enemy of Austria. Thus the affair is settled without our interference. Had we said that the terms offered to Austria were too severe, if we had modified them, and Austria had accepted them, we should be in a great position. Now Austria regards us as one who has deserted her." Mr. Disraeli went into a long argument to show that England ought not to attend any Congress, because the balance of power is not affected; because it is one thing to propose a Congress to prevent a war, another to go into one after a war, be bound by its engagements, and save other persons from difficulties they have created, and for which we are not answerable. "I tell the noble lord this—that it is his misfortune to believe that there exists throughout Italy a Whig party, and until he gets that idea out of his head he never will be able to consider the question in a manner becoming a statesman of his degree. It has always been the fashion of the noble lord, when speaking of Italy, to speak of establishing a sort of Brookes's Club at Florence. I told the noble lord some years ago that the course he was recommending was one which must end in the confusion of Italy; and that, if he thought the regeneration of Italy could be

effected by the secret societies of that country, he would find that he was only playing the game of some great military despot who would reap the profit." At the end of his speech Mr. Disraeli commented on the announcement that the French army and navy were to be reduced to a peace footing, and expressed a hope that there would be a real reduction of armaments, not a mere exchange of phrases; and that the policy of the Emperor would be met in a reciprocal spirit by the English Parliament.

Mr. Bowyer made a long speech, defending the Roman Government, and attacking Sardinia, whose policy, he said, in the Duchies, and in the Romagna, had been contrary to the law of nations.

Lord Palmerston recapitulated in the main the statements of Lord John Russell. Upon one point, in answer to the inquiry of Mr. Disraeli, he gave an interesting explanation of facts:—"The right honourable gentleman wished to know whether the Powers that were neutral in the war—and especially the British Government—made any proposal of terms of arrangement to the Emperor of Austria which were less favourable to the Austrian Government than those afterwards agreed upon at the peace of Villafranca. My noble friend stated that, as far as he was aware,—and certainly so far as this country was concerned,—no proposition was made to the Austrian Government from any of the neutral Powers. The right honourable gentleman seems, however, to have had pretty accurate information from some quarter or other as to what took

place. There was a period of the war at which the French Ambassador at this Court gave my noble friend a small bit of paper, upon which there were certain terms of arrangement, stated very generally, asking that the British Government would transmit them to the Government of Austria, and would recommend the terms as the bases upon which a treaty of peace might be concluded. My noble friend, in concert with his colleagues, felt that on the one hand it would be unbecoming on the part of this Government, anxious as we must naturally have been for the cessation of the war, to refuse altogether to be the channel of communications which one of the parties thought might be conducive to a peaceful settlement, and which the other party might or might not accept. We did not think it necessary absolutely to decline to be the channel of such a communication; on the other hand, we felt that the state of the two contending parties in the war was not such as, in our opinion, justified us in interposing by any communication on our own part. We, therefore, took the course which, I think, was the proper one. We said, 'We will communicate the proposals to the Austrian Minister; they contain your notions, not ours; but we will not accompany them by any advice or opinion, and we shall distinctly say that it is not a communication from us, but from you.' That was what passed; my noble friend gave the memorandum to the Austrian Minister, telling him that it was not our proposal, but the proposal of the French Government, and that

the Austrian Government might deal with it as it saw good; but as to the terms, we expressed no opinion whatever."

Lord Palmerston then, after explaining and justifying the conduct of our Government in 1848, observed that Mr. Disraeli had contended that we ought not, under any circumstances, to go into a Conference. But what Lord John Russell said was, that there were two parts in the treaty, one relating solely to the belligerents and to matters arising out of territories which were the seat of war; but there were other conditions relating to territories which the contending armies did not occupy, and with which the parties had no right to deal. Before, however, the Government decided whether they would be parties to the Conference, they ought to know what were the arrangements between France and Austria. Difficulties might arise, and questions that it would be necessary to discuss, and until they saw their way, it would be premature to decide. If they did see their way, he thought it would not only be desirable, but it would be the duty of the Government, to take part in the Conference. After replying to Mr. Bowyer, he pointed out the inconsistency of Mr. Disraeli in denouncing Conferences which the late Government had recommended, and condemned their proposal to guarantee Sardinia against any attack by Austria.

The debate was continued by Mr. Baillie, Mr. Milnes, and Mr. Whiteside, who reviewed, at much length and with considerable severity, the Italian policy of the Government in 1848.

Mr. Drummond expatiated
VOL. CI.

upon the power of the Papacy, and urged the danger to this country of meddling with affairs which did not concern us.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in replying to Mr. Whiteside, examined with great minuteness a statement made by him that, in 1848, Austria had offered to Lord Palmerston, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, if the British Government would intervene to restore peace, that Lombardy should be made entirely independent, and Venetia should receive a free constitution—a proposal which Sardinia had, he said, accepted. He showed that this statement was the result of a complete mistake on the part of Mr. Whiteside. In discussing the question whether this country should take part in the Conference, he urged the distinction between those provisions of the treaty which lay between the belligerents and those which were entirely beyond the sphere of the war, and belonged to the future relations of Italy. Under the circumstances, he thought it would be the grossest imprudence to come to a hasty conclusion to repudiate a Conference; and he had, he said, the strongest hope and conviction that the House of Commons would not consent to interpose between the Executive Government and the exercise of its discretion in the endeavour to give to the peace the form most conducive to the tranquillity of Europe.

Mr. Maguire defended the Papal Government against the strictures of Lord Palmerston, and drew a very flattering picture of the prosperity of the Romagna.

Lord C. Hamilton vindicated the accuracy of Mr. Whiteside's
[N]

statement, that Lord Palmerston had, in 1848, missed the opportunity of separating Lombardy from the Italian possessions of Austria.

Lord John Russell, on the other hand, maintained the accuracy of Mr. Gladstone's history of the transaction. He defended the mission of Lord Minto to Italy, and expressed his belief that if the people of that country were left to themselves they would adopt sound political institutions.

After some remarks by Lord Lovaine and Mr. Kinglake, the discussion terminated, the papers being ordered to lie on the table.

On the 29th of July, questions of some importance touching our foreign relations were addressed to the Government in the House of Commons.

Mr. Scully asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Sovereign of the Roman States had finally accepted or declined the position of President over the Confederate States of Italy; and whether, in the event of the Sovereign Pontiff accepting that office, it was intended, on the part of Her Majesty's Government to adopt effectual steps for establishing direct diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome.

Mr. Bentinck inquired whether there was any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to reduce the naval armament of the country, observing that the announcement of the intention of the Emperor of the French to disarm was no reason for reducing our armaments, but that it was the duty of the Government to continue to put our defences, military and naval, on

an efficient footing. He related, as an argument against relaxing our exertions, a dialogue between the Emperor of the French and a distinguished person, which had been reported to him on the subject of the French navy.

Lord Palmerston, in reply to Mr. Scully, said he was not competent to give an answer as to the intention of the Pope, as the Confederation had not been formed, and we had no relations with the Pope that would lead him to give us any information upon the subject; and with respect to the latter part of the question, he explained the state of our relations with the Court of Rome. In answer to Mr. Bentinck's question, Lord Palmerston said he might content himself with saying that the question must depend upon a great variety of circumstances. At the same time, he might say that, assuming the ground upon which the question was put, that the Emperor of the French had declared his intention to reduce his naval and military establishments, it would be premature for the Government to give any information as to what they would do in consequence of an event that had not yet happened. He had no hesitation, however, in saying that it would be impossible for the Government to enter into any agreement for the reduction of our establishments, naval or military, dependent upon the measures of another Government; and the House must remember that other Powers besides France had navies, and our friendly relations with them might alter, so that our naval and military arrangements depended not upon a single Power,

but the Government might be called upon any day to protect the various interests of the country.

On the 8th of August, a few days previous to the prorogation of Parliament, the affairs of the Continent again became the subject of debate in both Houses. In the House of Lords, the Marquis of Normanby originated the discussion, by asking a question respecting the proposals for peace submitted to Austria. The noble Marquis expressed his belief that this was the only country in which any mystery still existed in regard to the propositions of the peace of Villafranca. Those propositions were popularly believed on the Continent to be the joint production of M. de Persigny and Lord Palmerston, and were considered discreditable to our professed neutrality, which (in spite of the declared intention of the present Government to tread in the steps of their predecessors) had, in the opinion of other Powers, been often violated. In support of this opinion, he quoted a despatch from the Prussian Minister at Berlin to the Prussian Envoy at Vienna, and insisted that Lord John Russell, instead of uniting the policy of this country and Prussia, had established a complete breach between them. He proceeded to defend Austria against the charge brought against her of having been the first to declare war, and of having thereby abrogated the treaties of 1815; and pointed out that Austria had agreed to a mediation, which was rejected by Sardinia and France; and that Sardinia in 1848 had invaded Austria, but that the treaties of 1815 were not then considered to have been abro-

gated. Willing as he was to do justice to the noble impulses of Lord John Russell, he was afraid that the present Minister for Foreign Affairs had taken a one-sided view of the question, and had been misled by enthusiasts who would, he feared, be overborne by the Mazzinian party. In connexion with Mazzini, he reviewed the present state of affairs in Central Italy, and especially in Tuscany, whose present Government was most tyrannical, and defended the Grand Duke from the accusation that he had ordered the bombardment of Florence. He strongly deprecated any course by which England might be mixed up with these differences, and hoped we should not be parties to any Conference to settle Italian affairs.

Lord Wodehouse stated, that some days before the conclusion of peace at Villafranca, the French Ambassador gave Lord John Russell a statement concerning the *data* on which France was willing to make peace with Austria. Lord John Russell agreed to transmit the document to the Austrian Minister, but did not give any advice whatever in respect to it, as he did not think the time had arrived for Her Majesty's Government to interfere with effect. He declined to follow Lord Normanby into his attacks on the Tuscan and Piedmontese Governments, but contented himself with reminding him that if constitutional liberty should be established in Italy, it would be owing to Piedmont.

Lord Normanby asked Lord Granville, whether the transmission of the French proposals to Austria was or was not the act of the Cabinet?

[N 2]

Lord Granville answered in the affirmative.

In the House of Commons, on the same evening, Lord Elcho renewed his motion which had been previously postponed, for an address to Her Majesty, on the subject of Italian affairs, and which gave rise to a long and interesting debate. The address proposed by the noble Lord stated, that in the opinion of this House it would be consistent neither with the honour nor the dignity of this country to take part in any Conference for the purpose of settling the details of a peace, the preliminaries of which had been arranged between the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Austria. Premising that the late Government had (as he had stated in the preamble to his motion), pursued throughout the late negotiations a strict and impartial neutrality, and advertent to the discordant opinions entertained respecting the late hostilities in Italy, he avowed his concurrence with those who did not consider the war justifiable, or that Austria was the aggressor. Sardinia, he said, had pursued towards Austria a policy of provocation and insult. She had been long bent upon the war, and had made preparations for it. He could not, therefore, sympathize with Sardinia and France, and he insisted that the principle of armed intervention, on the ground assigned by the latter, was one against which we ought to protest. The neutrality of the present Government, instead of being similar to that of the late, had been, he said, rather that of an advocate and a partizan. Neutrality was defined to be a state of indifference, of

neither friendship nor hostility; but the neutrality of the present Government was not of that indifferent character. What they had sought in 1848 they sought now—the exclusion of Austria from Italy. In urging the expediency of this country taking part in the Conference, he maintained that the true policy of this country was that of non-intervention—a policy strongly advocated by the late Sir Robert Peel. The Government said they did not mean to go into the Conference on any questions of detail; but if they entered it as friends of Italy, and upon its general affairs, what did they propose to do with reference to the Duchies, to the States of the Church, to the French occupation of Rome? If we had confidence in the Emperor of the French, let us, he said, keep out of the Conference; if we distrusted him, *à fortiori*, let us keep out of the Conference. He sympathized with Italy, and believed that it would be for the good of that country that we should abstain, as far as possible, from interference in its affairs.

Mr. Kinglake moved the “previous question,” because he conceived, he said, that Lord Elcho’s proposal could not be appropriately met by either an affirmative or a negative vote. The motion tended to express distrust in Her Majesty’s Ministers, and it was so near a vote of want of confidence that hardly any man could consent to vote for one who would not consent to vote for the other. It was rash to lay down a rule to operate in future, in total ignorance of what circumstances might arise to modify the rule. Holding the Ministers answerable for the

consequences, he was prepared to concede to them the confidence which was an indispensable condition of all true responsibility. He admitted that his objections to our joining in the Conference were very strong; and he enumerated some of those objections, and stated the conditions under which he would not disapprove of England's going into a Congress to settle the details of the territorial arrangements of Italy.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, so far as he and his colleagues were concerned, they were prepared to meet the motion with a direct negative; but if the House was of opinion that it was inconvenient to entertain the motion at all, they were ready to concur in the motion which Mr. Kinglake had made, without any concert with them. The original motion spoke of taking part in a Conference for the purpose of settling the details of the peace between the two Emperors. He was not aware of any such intention. The details of the peace would be settled by the belligerents themselves, and what remained would be, not the details of the peace, but great questions of European policy, vitally affecting the happiness of Italy. The principal point made by Lord Elcho was, the contrast between the neutrality of the late and that of the present Governments. He (Mr. Gladstone) gave credit to the late Government, represented by Lord Malmesbury, for their intentions, and for a sincere assiduity to maintain peace, and there had been no departure from that neutrality on the part of the present Government. The object of Lord Elcho's motion was

to prevent the Government from taking part in the Conference, lest they should be hostile to Austria. To disclaim such a motive, he said, was needless, and would be disparaging. There was no foundation for such a supposition. It was the desire of the Government to see Austria strong, flourishing, and happy; but it did not follow that they might not have their own feeling and conviction that she might, by another policy, better discharge her duties and consult her own separate and individual interests. To understand the present position of Austria, it was necessary to go back for the last forty-five years. During that interval, wherever liberty raised its head in Italy, it was crushed by the iron hand of Austria, and abuses were re-established in all their rigour. The position of Sardinia, with her improved institutions, became of necessity a standing danger to Austria. It was necessary that the British Government should consider what, in the present state of circumstances, was best for Italy, for Austria, and for Europe. Might not Austria be stronger out of Italy than in it? This was an opinion which might be held by honest men, and he was himself strongly of that opinion. But the true policy of this country, according to Lord Elcho, was the policy of non-intervention. What then, asked Mr. Gladstone (triumphantly exhibiting the blue-book), was the policy adopted and enforced in these papers? "If you go into the Conference," Lord Elcho said, "are you prepared to do this or to do that?" His (Mr. Gladstone's) answer was, that the questions he referred to

had not been proposed. The question for the House to decide was, 'would it, by a dry, hard, rigid formula, take upon itself the functions of the Executive?' Lord Elcho argued that we had confidence in the Emperor of the French, or we had not, and in either case we should not enter into the Conference. He agreed that if we had not confidence, and were essentially at variance with France, it would be a question of prudence how far we should enter into the Conference; but he could not understand the other branch of the dilemma, which would come to this,—that, whatever be the liberal sentiments of the Emperor of the French, we should refuse to assist him, but leave him to struggle with his difficulties. This was a recommendation which he earnestly entreated the House to discountenance.

Mr. S. Fitzgerald denied that the motion of Lord Elcho was open to objection as to its form, its object, or its wording. He defended the policy of the late Government, and pointed out the hazard to which the taking part in the Conference would expose England, if the majority were to enforce its decisions by arms, or to enter into guarantees. He dwelt upon the complications that must arise from the utter divergence of opinion between our representative and those with whom he would have to act, with reference to the political condition of the various States of Italy, and especially to the temporal authority of the Pope. Divergencies of opinion, he observed, must occur, which rendered it undesirable for an English representative to take part in the Con-

ference, since his presence would be either dangerous or degrading to this country. Mr. Fitzgerald entered into many details, and put various questions to the Government relative to the proposals made to them by M. de Persigny, to be communicated to the Austrian Ambassador for the cessation of hostilities—a transaction which, he said, had produced most important and injurious effects.

Lord Harry Vane did not see that any good would arise from our presence in the Conference at this time, and thought it most desirable that this country should avoid any responsibility respecting the settlement of the affairs of Italy.

Mr. B. Cochrane said, if he had had any doubt of the expediency of Lord Elcho's motion, it would have been set at rest by the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which betrayed the feeling with which the Government would approach the Conference. The whole antecedents of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, proved to him that they could not enter it in a neutral spirit, but could take only one course. If we were to be, as we ought to be, neutral, the neutrality must be honestly carried out; and this had not been done by such a speech as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which was that of a partizan.

Mr. C. Gilpin observed, that the question before the House was, not whether it was desirable to take any part in any present Conference, but whether it was desirable to bind the hands of the Government not, under possible circumstances, to have anything to do with any Conference.

It would be most objectionable, he said, so to bind any Government supposed to have the confidence of the House of Commons.

Mr. M. Milnes believed that the speech of Mr. Gladstone expressed the feelings of the people of this country, and rightly interpreted their understanding of what was meant by a neutral position which should not impede the expression of their sentiments on questions of right and justice. A refusal to take part in a Conference might be not only impolitic, but uncourteous towards other Powers of Europe.

Mr. Horsman observed, that the motion involved a very important principle, which in the speeches opposed to it had been evaded or misrepresented. The motion was not, as represented by Mr. Gladstone, an unqualified assertion of an abstract principle, but a very precise and definite application of a rule of policy affirmed by the country. The motion originated in an announcement by Lord Palmerston, to the effect that the Government would be ready to enter into the Conference for the purpose of settling the details of the Treaty of Villafranca. The motion, therefore, grappled at once with the object. Now, it was said the intention of entering the Conference was abandoned; but on what ground abandoned? That it would be at variance with the policy which Parliament had affirmed?—or was it only a temporary abandonment, to be recalled during the recess? The motion called upon the House to stand by the principle of strict neutrality, and not to allow the country to be plunged into a

turbid sea of complications. There were two questions—first, what was it we wished to achieve at the Conference? Secondly, what chance had we of success? Free institutions for Italy, and the removal of foreign troops from its territory, were to be the objects,—being Lord John Russell's confession of Italian faith. But was there the slightest hope that a European Congress would consent to them? Here, then, were the elements not only of war, but of a dozen wars. He hoped the House would forbid the Government from going into the Conference, by which we could not serve Italy, but might lower ourselves.

Mr. S. Herbert denied that Lord Palmerston had said anything about going into Conference to settle the details of the Treaty of Villafranca. The Government had never been asked to join in settling those details, nor had they, as alleged, snatched at the notion of joining the Conference. Although we had not been belligerents, that was no argument against entering the Conference; and would it be right for England, if asked on terms which afforded a chance of success, to refuse to take part in a Conference by which a more permanent arrangement might be made for the security of Italy? He did not say they were going into the Conference, but if difficulties were removed and objections at an end, a refusal to do so would be a dereliction of duty on the part of the Government.

Mr. Whiteside defended the motion, supposing it to be of a general character, from the objection that it would be a direct interference with the Executive.

Looking at the terms of the preliminaries of Villafranca, and at the declarations of Lord John Russell, he professed his ignorance of what remained for a general settlement. The whole matter appeared to have been decided, and England was to be called upon merely to lend her sanction to arrangements, the fundamental points of which were contained in the treaty.

Lord John Russell observed, that the motion proposed an address to the Crown not to do a thing which it was never asked to do by anybody, and which there was not the smallest intention to do. It might be supposed, and Mr. Horsman had suggested, that, though there was no present intention, the Crown should be advised not to go into any Conference whatever; but Lord Elcho had said he meant nothing of the kind. Adverting to the dangers pointed out by Mr. Fitzgerald if we were to go into the Conference, he remarked that the motion was general, and precluded the Government from entering into a Congress hereafter. The preliminaries of Villafranca did not propose to regulate definitively the settlement of Italy. That country might be threatened by a bloody revolution or a foreign intervention; and if Russia, Prussia, and England, by joining the Congress, could agree to the terms upon which a confederation might be formed, were we to say we had registered a vow in heaven against entering into a Conference? As other questions were left to the advisers of the Crown, subject to their responsibility, so this question should be left to them. When the time came, and they knew all

the circumstances, they would be able to say "aye" or "no" to the proposition; though at present, so far from being an advocate for a Conference, he saw more objections against it than reasons for it. He gave full details of the circumstances attending the propositions received from M. de Persigny and referred to by Mr. Fitzgerald, observing that, although the Government claimed no credit in the matter, he did rejoice that peace had been the result.

Mr. Disraeli, having replied to accusations made against him by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, observed that the latter had evaded the practical question under consideration. He had frankly placed his Italian policy before the House; and if these large and decided views were shared by his colleagues, and indicated the predominant opinion of the Cabinet, then the policy under which the Government proposed to enter the Conference was to put an end to the settlement of forty-five years ago; and he pointed out some of the consequences of this policy. With reference to the communication from the French Ambassador, Lord John Russell's explanation, he said, had been ample, except upon the most material point, whether he had generally approved of the proposal, and whether that approbation was communicated to the Emperor of the French. He objected to the motion, that it called upon the House to give an opinion upon the question on what was practically the last night of the Session, and he trusted that Lord Elcho would not press it to a division.

Lord Palmerston commented

upon the remarks made by Mr. Disraeli in the last Parliament, upon the conduct of the Austrian and the Sardinian Governments respectively, when he characterized that of the latter as ambiguous, and eulogized the spirit of dignified conciliation manifested by Austria. He denied that any approbation had been expressed of the paper received from the French Ambassador; and, with respect to the Conference, the Government, he said, were not proposing to go into a Conference at all, but if they did, it would not be to upset the arrangements of 1815. He was of opinion that Austria would be stronger if she had no Italian possessions; but it was one thing to hold this opinion, and another to enter into measures to change arrangements founded upon treaties that were the basis of a great European settlement.

Lord Elcho, in reply, defended his motion, but said, that being satisfied with the discussion, he should not press for a division; accordingly the question was not put.

The Estimates for the public service having been passed in the House of Commons, and the necessary business of the Session being completed, it was not thought advisable by the Government to protract the sitting of Parliament beyond the usual period, for the purpose of introducing any new measures. Although the labours of the Legislature this year had been short and much interrupted by Ministerial changes, and the Dissolution of Parliament, it would have served little purpose to keep the two Houses sitting into the autumn, experience having proved the great difficulty of inducing

the members to remain in town at that season. It was resolved, therefore, to bring the Session to a close about the second week in August; and on the 13th of that month, all impediments being removed, Parliament was prorogued by Commission, in the usual form. The Royal Assent having been given to various Bills, the Lord Chancellor read from the Throne the following speech:—

“My Lords and Gentlemen,—

“We are commanded by Her Majesty to release you from further attendance in Parliament, and at the same time to convey to you Her Majesty’s acknowledgment for the zeal and assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the performance of your duties during the session of Parliament now about to close.

“Various circumstances which occasioned interruptions in the usual course of business have prevented the completion of important matters which Her Majesty pointed out to the attention of Her Parliament in the beginning of the present year; but Her Majesty trusts that those matters will be taken into your earnest consideration at an early period of the next session.

“The war which has broken out in Northern Italy having been brought to a close by the Peace of Villafranca, various overtures have been made to Her Majesty with a view to ascertain whether, if Conferences should be held by the great Powers of Europe for the purpose of settling arrangements connected with the present state and future condition of Italy, a plenipotentiary would be sent by Her Majesty to assist at

such Conferences, but Her Majesty has not yet received the information necessary to enable Her Majesty to decide whether she may think fit to take part in any such negotiations.

"Her Majesty would rejoice to find herself able to contribute to the establishment of arrangements calculated to place the general peace on a satisfactory and lasting foundation.

"Her Majesty, in accordance with the stipulations of the Treaty of Tientsing, has instructed her Plenipotentiary in China to repair to the Imperial Court at Peking, and Her Majesty trusts that such direct communication with the Imperial Government will have a beneficial effect upon the relations between the two countries.

"Her Majesty commands us to inform you that she looks forward with confidence to the continued maintenance of those friendly relations which so happily subsist between Her Majesty and all Foreign Powers and States.

"Her Majesty is glad to be able to congratulate you on the complete restoration of tranquillity in her Indian dominions. It will be her earnest endeavour to promote their internal improvement, and to obliterate the traces of those conflicts which Her Majesty witnessed with such deep concern.

"The financial arrangements of that portion of Her Majesty's empire will continue to engage Her Majesty's serious attention.

"Her Majesty has had much satisfaction in giving her assent to the Bills which you presented to her for the formation of a naval and military reserve force. A complete and permanent system

of national defence must at all times be an object of paramount importance.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—

"Her Majesty commands us to convey to you her cordial thanks for the readiness and zeal with which you have provided the necessary supplies for the service of the year.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—

"Her Majesty commands us to express to you her heartfelt gratification at witnessing the general well-being and contentment which prevail throughout her dominions. The happiness of Her Majesty's people is the object dearest to her heart.

"In returning to your respective counties you will have duties to perform intimately connected with the attainment of this great end, and Her Majesty fervently prays that the blessing of Almighty God may attend your exertions in the performance of those duties for the common good of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects."

The Session then terminated. As far as legislative results were concerned, it was remarkably unfruitful, the number of measures added to the statute book during its progress being unusually small. In fact, scarcely any Acts were passed, except those necessary to give effect to the financial arrangements for this country and India, and to carry on the annual legislative business of the nation. The interruption caused by the change of Ministry and the dissolution of Parliament frustrated all other projects, and

virtually occasioned the loss of a year to the practical agency of the Legislature. The only advantage gained from the party conflicts, by which the time of Parliament was occupied, was that the state of public opinion and the relative strength of parties

were more thoroughly ascertained, and thus the ground was cleared for those important operations in the direction of financial reform, and of constitutional changes, to which the expectation of the public pointed as the work of the ensuing year.

CHAPTER VII.

WAR IN ITALY.—*Unfriendly relations between Austria and Sardinia—Growth of Austrian influence in Italy—Treaties with Tuscany and Modena—Reception of the Austrian Minister by the French Emperor on New Year's-day—Speech of the King of Sardinia at the Opening of the Chambers—Marriage of Prince Napoleon to the Daughter of Victor Emmanuel—Circular of Count Buol to the Diplomatic Agents of Austria—Loan authorized by the Sardinian Chambers—Speech of Count Cavour—Exposition by him of Grievances against Austria—Speech of the Emperor Napoleon at the Opening of the French Chambers—Case of Sardinia against Austria as detailed by the Sardinian Government—Counter Statement of the Austrian Government—Attempts of the British Government to mediate between the Parties—Lord Cowley's Confidential Mission to Vienna—Russia proposes a Congress—Views of Sardinia and Austria on this Question—Final Effort of the British Government to maintain Peace—Attitude of Prussia.*

AT the close of last year it was a little thought that before a few months had elapsed a gigantic struggle would take place between the armies of France and Sardinia on the one side, and the army of Austria on the other; and that, as the result of one short campaign, Lombardy would be wrested from the grasp of Austria, the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Modena annexed to Piedmont, and the first great era of Italian independence would begin. Europe was in a state of profound peace, and France had given no indication of wishing to disturb it. Russia, the other great Power, which has generally been looked upon with most suspicion, and as most likely to cause complications by an aggressive and ambitious policy in the East, was wholly occupied with internal reforms, and the inert mass of Austria was known to be so pressed down with

debt that she wanted only to engage in war would be to court financial ruin. Besides, she had already shown, by her determined neutrality in the Crimean war, that hardly anything short of direct attack would drag her into hostilities. It was from the kingdom of Sardinia that the cloud arose, which soon spread over the political horizon, and involved two mighty empires in a desperate struggle. Ever since the disastrous events of 1848-9, terminating in the battle of Novara, the relations of Piedmont and Austria had been of an unfriendly character, and the undisguised sympathy professed by the Government of Victor Emmanuel for the cause of Italian independence in the north of Italy, which meant simply the throwing off the Austrian yoke, at last led to the withdrawal of the Austrian Minister from Turin. There can be little doubt that the

reason why Sardinia took part in the war against Russia in the Crimea—a quarrel in which she had no direct conceivable interest—was to conciliate the friendship and engage the alliance of the Western Powers, upon whose protection she might rely in case of a second collision with Austria; and it was to France that Victor Emmanuel chiefly looked for military support—nor did he look in vain. But there were great difficulties in the way of finding a pretext for a war, which the public opinion of Europe would justify—and happily, at the present day, the most ambitious States so far do homage to public opinion, that they endeavour to enlist it on their side before they venture to draw the sword. Lombardy was secured to Austria by treaty, and she held it by as good a title as that by which Sardinia herself possessed the territory of Genoa.* Nor could France dare to assist Victor Emmanuel in an unprovoked attempt to wrest it from her, unless she were prepared to fling the Treaties of 1815 to the winds, and proclaim a war of aggression, which would have arrayed all the other great Powers of Europe in arms against her. But Austria had not confined herself in Italy to the legitimate exercise of the rights confirmed to her by the

* The second article of the treaty signed at Vienna between Great Britain and Sardinia, on the 20th of May, in 1815, provides that—"The States which composed the former Republic of Genoa are united for ever to the States of His Majesty the King of Sardinia, in order to be, as those are, possessed by him in full property, sovereignty, and inheritance, from male to male, in the order of primogeniture, in the two branches of his house—to wit, the Royal branch, and the branch of Savoy Carignan."

Congress at Vienna. Her influence extended to and overshadowed the Duchies of Tuscany, Modena, and Parma. Her troops occupied the Legations, and even at Naples her authority was predominant. It was this which kept down and crushed the spirit of Italian independence, which would otherwise have soon overpowered the feeble Governments of Italy; and it was owing to the determination of the French Emperor to relieve the Peninsula from the incubus that thus oppressed it—not, we may well believe, in a spirit of Quixotic chivalry, but with a view to solid advantages for France—that the war, of which we are about to relate the history, arose. We cannot undertake to justify it, on the part of either France or Sardinia, but we will not affect to be grieved at the result. Our sympathies are with the Italian cause, and we cannot regret that despotism has been exchanged for constitutional liberty—that free institutions have taken the place of Austrian bayonets, and that Lombardy is no longer a garrison held by an alien and hated race. We will first give a rapid sketch of the growth of Austrian influence in Italy independently of her acquisitions of Lombardy and Venetia. In 1815 a treaty, called a "defensive alliance" was concluded between the Emperor of Austria and the Grand Duke of Tuscany, which was declared to have for its object the defence of their respective States, and the maintenance of the internal and external tranquillity of Italy. The following were the principal Articles:—

"Art. 2. The Emperor of Aus-

tria and the Grand Duke of Tuscany reciprocally guarantee to each other all the States which they possess in Italy, conformably to the stipulations of the general Treaty of Vienna.

"Art. 8. On every occasion when the Italian Peninsula shall be threatened with war, the two contracting Powers, after concerting previously together, shall exert their good offices to prevent that war. Should, however, their efforts be of no avail, they now declare, once for all, that they will consider any attack, or any threatening aggression on their respective possessions in Italy as also directed personally against such of the two as might not be attacked.

"Art. 4. The Emperor engages to furnish 80,000 men of all arms; the Grand Duke at least 6000 men.

"Art. 7. The Emperor of Austria and the Grand Duke of Tuscany engage and promise, in case they should find themselves in a war for the defence of Italy, not to make or listen to any proposition for a truce or peace, and not to negotiate or conclude with the enemy or enemies they may have, without having first come to a mutual agreement on the subject, and having reciprocally communicated to each other everything which may have come to their knowledge of any interest whatever for the safety of Italy and the tranquillity of their respective possessions."

A treaty of May 20, 1815, between Austria and Sardinia, confirmed to the latter kingdom the right of reversion to the duchy of Placentia, stipulated for by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, and by the Treaty of Paris of 1763. The Treaty of Vienna

(1815) arranged that the duchies of Modena, Reggio, and Mirandola should be possessed by the Archduke of Este and his successors; and the duchy of Massa by the Archduchess of Este, who was also to hold the principality of Carrara and the Imperial fief of Lunigiana. To the ex-Empress of France, the Archduchess Maria Louisa, second consort of Napoleon the Great, were assigned the duchies of Parma, Placentia, and Guastalla. Tuscany was secured to the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. The rights of succession and reversion established in the branches of the Archdukes of Austria relative to the duchies of Modena, Reggio, and Mirandola, as also of the principalities of Massa and Carrara were preserved. The reversion of the duchy of Parma and Placentia was to be determined by common accord between the Courts of Austria, Russia, France, Spain, Prussia, and England, always having regard to the rights of reversion possessed by the House of Austria and the King of Sardinia to the said countries. The principality of Lucca, created into a duchy, was to be possessed in entire sovereignty by Her Majesty the Infanta Maria Louisa and her descendants in the direct male line, an income of 500,000*l.* being added by the Emperor of Austria and his Imperial Highness under certain contingencies. The duchy of Lucca was to revert to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, if it became vacant by the death of Her Majesty the Infanta Maria Louisa, or of her son Don Carlos, or supposing the Infanta to obtain another "establishment." The Marches, with Camerino, &c., were restored

to the Holy See, as also the Legations of Ravenna, Ferrara, and Bologna. The Emperor of Austria, however, was to have the right of placing garrisons at Ferrara and Commachio.

In 1847 a Treaty was made between the Emperor of Austria and the Duke of Modena, which was called a "special convention," and the principal Articles were the following:—

"Art. 1. Whenever the Italian States of the Emperor of Austria or the territory of the Duke of Modena are threatened with attack from without, the two contracting parties are mutually bound to give every support in their power as soon as one of the two parties shall ask for it.

"Art. 2. As hereby the States of the Duke of Modena enter into the line of defence of the Italian provinces of the Emperor of Austria, the Duke of Modena grants the right to the Emperor of Austria to march Austrian troops into the Modenese territory and to garrison the fortified places therein whenever the interests of the common defence or military prudence should render it necessary.

"Art. 3. Should events take place in the States of the Duke of Modena which might lead to the apprehension that quiet and order would be disturbed, or should tumultuous movements take place of a nature likely to assume an insurrectional character, the suppression of which would exceed the means at the disposal of the Government, the Emperor of Austria, as soon as applied to, is bound to give immediately all the military support necessary to maintain or restore order.

"Art. 4. The Duke of Modena pledges himself not to conclude a military convention of any description whatsoever without the consent of the Emperor of Austria."

We proceed now with the events of the present year.

When the French Emperor received the foreign ambassadors at the Tuileries, on the 1st of January, he addressed M. Hubner, the Austrian Minister, in the following terms:—"I regret that our relations with your Government are not so good as they have been hitherto; but I beg you to assure the Emperor that my personal feelings towards him are not changed." This language from the despotic ruler of France to the representative at his court of a power in amity with France naturally excited much comment at the time, and people were forcibly reminded of the abrupt and rude remarks addressed by the first Napoleon to Lord Whitworth, the English Minister at Paris in 1803, which immediately preceded the rupture of the Peace of Amiens, and were the ominous mutterings of the storm which burst over Europe and convulsed it for twelve years. With the view of allaying the apprehension thus occasioned the *Moniteur*, the official organ of the French Government, announced that for some days past public opinion had been agitated by alarming rumours, which it was the duty of the Government to put an end to by declaring that there was nothing in the diplomatic relations of France which warranted the fears which the rumours tended to create. But the result

proved that the instinct of the public was not deceived, and that the few words spoken at a *levée* were intended to convey a meaning which did warrant the fears of all men that France and Austria would soon be at war.

The session of the Sardinian Chambers was opened on the 10th of January by the King in person, and in the speech which he delivered he made a significant allusion to the state of Italy in the following terms:—

“The horizon in whose midst the new year rises is not entirely serene; notwithstanding this, you will apply yourselves with your usual alacrity to your Parliamentary labours.

“Encouraged by the experience of the past, we are prepared resolutely to encounter the eventualities of the future.

“That future will be a happy one, our policy reposing on justice, on love of liberty and of our country.

“Our country, small in territory, has acquired credit in the councils of Europe, because it is great through the idea it represents and the sympathies it inspires. This position is not exempt from perils, since, while we respect treaties, we are not insensible to the cry of suffering which reaches us from so many parts of Italy.

“Strong by our concord, confiding in our good right, we await, prudent and decided, the decrees of Divine Providence.”

It is, of course, difficult to know what was the exact nature of the understanding between the Emperor of the French and the King of Sardinia with reference to an interference on the part of France in the politics of

Italy—or as it was generally called the Italian question—but subsequent events have made it almost certain that there was an agreement between them that if Sardinia, by the help of France, succeeded in obtaining in Italy a large accession of territory at the expense of the existing Governments, then Victor Emmanuel was to cede to France a portion of his own territory—namely, Savoy, the cradle of his race, and also Nice, with its adjoining district. And, in all probability, it was also arranged that a new kingdom should be carved out for the Napoleon family by allying in marriage Prince Louis Napoleon to the Royal family of Sardinia, and seating him upon a throne in Italy in case the chances of war should create a vacancy in the Government of any of the three duchies of Parma, Modena, or Tuscany. This was, no doubt, part of the price which the King of Sardinia was prepared to pay for French assistance to enable him to cope with Austria, and in accordance with the concerted plan, the hand of the Princess Clothilde, the only daughter of Victor Emmanuel, then not quite sixteen years old, was formally demanded on the 23rd of January by General Neil, on behalf of the Emperor of the French, for his cousin, Prince Napoleon. The marriage subsequently took place on the 30th of the same month. In the meantime Austria was fully conscious that a struggle was impending, and was anxious to enlist on her side, if possible, the strength of the great Germanic Confederation in case she was dragged into a war with France in defence of her Italian possessions.

On the 5th of February, Count Buol Schauenstein, the head of the Vienna Cabinet, addressed a despatch to the representatives of Austria at the different foreign courts, in which he said:—

“The language of German statesmen, as of the press, has widely spread the impression that Germany would look upon itself as threatened as a united Power, if Austria, by an unjust attack on her possessions in Italy, should find herself called upon to take up arms against one of the greatest military Powers in Europe. The convictions of the whole of Germany have united in an energetic protest against a return to the days of the Confederation of the Rhine. With a common consent which commands respect, public opinion has declared that if the rupture of the public law of Europe should threaten a German Power, even should it only be at first in her non-German possessions, all her allies ought to make common cause with her, so as to preserve peace by the moral force of so powerful a union, and in case, against all expectation, that result should not be obtained, would in common protect from attack the possessions of a member of the Confederation, as well as the sanctity of treaties; and thus shield, at the same time, the honour, the dignity, the safety, and the power of united Germany.

“We must take into careful consideration the presumed effect that will be caused abroad, as well as upon the internal situation of the Confederation; and, under the necessary influence of those considerations, we, for the present, are inclined to the opinion

VOL. CI.

that the firm establishment of the common action of Germany with Austria, in case of war, ought not to assume the obligatory forms of the Federal Constitution as long as the realization of the eventuality for the advent of which the community is prepared has not presented itself as certain. But we need not give the assurance that the opinions our august allies may wish to bring to bear upon this essential point may beforehand count upon our most serious attention, and will be by us eagerly taken into consideration.

“Nevertheless, we think it is decidedly desirable already that the Governments of Germany, as members of one great body, should mutually communicate the convictions which animate them in the face of the dangers of the future, which it is impossible to disown, and prepare themselves, by a firm agreement, to hold at the proper time the same language, conformable to the circumstances, and efficacious either towards Sardinia or towards France, or finally towards both States together. We shall receive with lively interest and warm gratitude the assurance that this view is shared by our allies, and that, in particular, the Government to which you have the honour of being accredited is, on its part, disposed to co-operate in the establishment of the full certainty that Germany will act in concert with Austria, a result the success of which would be certain, especially by choosing the proper moment and the suitable form.”

On the same day on which this despatch was written, Signor Lanza, Minister of Finance, pre-

[O]

sented to the Sardinian Chamber of Deputies a *projet de loi*, to authorize the Government to contract a loan for 50,000,000*f.*, and made the following statement in support of the proposed measure:—

“The extraordinary armaments of Austria in the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom, and particularly along the frontier of the Po and Ticino, are known. Some days before the opening of our Parliament the official *Gazette* of Vienna announced the despatch into Italy of a *corps d'armée*, which, joined to the other troops already stationed there, forms an army much more powerful than is required in time of peace for the protection of public order and of internal security.

“But what renders the situation more serious is the distribution and concentration of those forces, which, collected principally between the Adda and the Ticino, are quartered in strong masses at Cremona, Piacenza, and Pavia, and therefore assume the aggressive aspect of a corps of operations against a neighbouring Power.

“Other indications of no tranquillizing nature are to be found in the military occupation by detached corps of the villages along the Ticino and the Po; in the frequent movements of troops on our frontiers; in the orders given to hold military stores and quarters in readiness in many places. These facts certainly reveal in the Austrian Government dispositions of no pacific nature. Add to this that it has recently issued a decree prohibiting the exportation of horses into Piedmont, and that it has contracted a loan of 150,000,000*f.* In pre-

sence of such hostile manifestations and warlike preparations, evidently directed against our country, public opinion was agitated, and it became the duty of the King's Government to take those more urgent precautions to which it was counselled by the gravity of the circumstances and the duty of guarding the security and honour of the country.

“It is precisely to continue the preparations of defence that have been commenced, in order to be ready for any events, that the King's Government now applies to Parliament for permission to contract a loan of 50,000,000*f.*

“We feel, gentlemen, as much as any one the necessity of avoiding new burdens on the country, and an increased weight upon the finances of the State, and we are grieved to be compelled to propose them. But in the life of nations there arise, as you know, supreme moments, in which sacrifices are a sacred duty, an inevitable necessity. The Government, trusting to your known patriotism, does not doubt that you will be united and decided in conceding to it the means necessary for the defence of the country, and, with it, of the national honour, liberty, and independence. Therefore it proposes to you the following project of law, and begs you to declare it urgent.”

After a spirited debate in the Chamber, the *projet de loi* was carried by a majority of 116 to 35.

At the same time the Sardinian Government published an elaborate vindication of its policy in a circular addressed to its diplomatic agents at foreign courts. In this document Count Cavour,

the Prime Minister, called attention to the threatening conduct of Austria. He said :—

“In the first days of January, before the King had pronounced the opening speech of the new legislative session, the Vienna Cabinet announced in its official journal the sending of a *corps d'armée* of 30,000 men into Italy. This corps, added to three others which are established there in a permanent manner, would increase the strength of the Austrian army to an extent out of proportion to what the maintenance of order and of internal tranquillity could require.

“At the same time that these troops were sent into Lombardy and Venetia with an extraordinary rapidity, frontier battalions, which leave their country only in case of war, were seen to arrive. The garrisons of Bologna and Ancona were reinforced. But, what is most serious, Austria concentrated considerable forces on our frontier; she collected between the Adda and the Ticino, and especially between Cremona, Piacenza, and Pavia, a real corps of operation, which certainly could not be destined to maintain order in those towns, of quite secondary importance.

“For some days the left bank of the Ticino presented the appearance of a country in which war was about to break out.

“The villages were occupied by detached corps—everywhere quarters were prepared and measures were taken to form stores. Videttes were placed even on the bridge of Buffalora, which marks the limits of the two countries. I say nothing of the menacing language used publicly at Milan and in other towns by the greater

part of the Austrian officers, without excepting those of eminent rank, for I know that one must not always render Governments responsible for the language of their agents.

“But I think it necessary to call attention to the reception given at Venice to the troops coming from Vienna, and to the ostentation with which vast preparations have been made at Piacenza, by occupying forts constructed in contempt of treaties, which they have appeared to neglect for some time past.”

Count Cavour defended the proposal for a loan in an eloquent speech, in the course of which he said—“It has been said that English Ministers and the principal orators who took part in the discussion on the address to the Crown, manifested opinions highly favourable to peace, and contrary to the pretended projects of Piedmont to engage in an aggressive war. I do not dissimulate the gravity of this argument. No one in this Chamber gives greater weight than I do to the opinion of English statesmen; from infancy I have been accustomed to respect that country as the one from which I have acquired the greater part of the political knowledge that has guided me in my career. I esteem and respect England, which I regard as one of the first Powers in the world; I venerate it, because I consider it as the rock where liberty has found, and might again find an impregnable refuge. I have always preferred, as far as was possible, the English alliance; I have done it as a writer and as a Minister to such a point, that I have been often reproached as an Anglo-
[O 2]

manian. If you recall our acts and policy, you will perceive how dear the alliance of England has been to us. Examine our commercial provisions, the part we took in the Eastern question and the Congress of Paris, and you will see how great has been our care to acquire and maintain the friendship, the sympathy, the benevolence of that great and noble nation. I may be allowed to say that our efforts have not been all in vain, and that we have up to a certain point attained the aim proposed. At the Paris Congress England gave us her powerful support, and manifested the same views on many points of the Italian question; and still to-day, if she does not fully share our opinions, or to speak plainly, if she passes on the Italian question a judgment which I hold to be in great part erroneous, she expresses it in a manner which still denotes her sympathy and friendship; so that, while I deplore the judgment passed by some English statesmen on our affairs, I cannot be otherwise than sensible in the manner in which the principal orators spoke concerning us. And, since the honourable Beauregard has alluded to the speech pronounced by Lord Derby, I will invite him to read that speech in the original English, and he will see that if, when speaking of the speech from the Throne, he employed an adjective which, perhaps, is not sufficiently appropriate, when speaking of the country he called it glorious, and said that Piedmont had a much greater importance than that given to it by its size. It seems to me difficult for a statesman to express himself in more fitting terms in regard to

another country. I do not deny that there has been a modification of opinion on the part of many English statesmen with respect to this country since 1856. The English people have many great virtues, among the first of which patriotism is prominent. The Englishman considers all questions from the national point of view; and when he judges that the interests of England are at stake other considerations lose much of their weight. Unfortunately, after 1856 England thought it necessary for the interests of her policy to draw towards Austria; she thought to find in that Power, which had given her no support on the battle field, but which had assisted her on the field of diplomacy, a sure ally in the Eastern question. This *rapprochement* somewhat modified her opinion and her tendencies in the Italian question. She maintained and maintains them as regards Southern and Central Italy, but has modified them with respect to Northern Italy. She judges the Neapolitan and Roman Governments now as she did three years ago, but has seen in the regimen of the other provinces on the left of the Po a transformation which we who are nearer to them have been unable to discover. The cry of suffering which arises from Naples and Bologna still reaches, with the same intensity, the banks of the Thames; while, unfortunately, to the tears and lamentations that burst forth from Milan and Venice an inexorable barrier is opposed by the Austrian Alps. This is grave, gentlemen, I do not deny it, but it does not wholly dishearten me; I have faith in the right sense and generous

sentiments of the English nation; I know by experience that with the English public the cause of justice and truth always triumphs in the end; I know that the principles of liberty, that just and noble causes, find in that generous people ardent and eloquent defenders, and that when one succeeds in detaching a question from the shackles of sophistry, and in placing it clearly and plainly before that great nation, the probabilities of success are on the side of right, of progress, and of civilization. I am not disheartened, gentlemen, because, although I have not attained the extreme limit of age, I remember to have seen repeatedly triumph in England causes that were defended in the name of justice and of liberty, although opposed by prejudices and by individual interests and by the sentiments of caste. The contests may be long, but success is certain. I remember the great struggle to which gave rise the emancipation of Ireland, and I also recollect the triumph; I still recollect the longer and more obstinate contests for the emancipation of the negro race, that great cause which was opposed by the most powerful interests of the colonies, and by the prejudices of almost all the commercial classes of England. The cause of Italy, gentlemen, is not less sacred, not less worthy to move generous minds than that of the Irish or that of the black race; it also will triumph before the tribunal of English public opinion. I cannot believe that the illustrious statesman at the head of the counsels of the Crown in England, and who had the great good fortune of asso-

ciating the distinguished name transmitted to him by history with the great cause of negro emancipation, will be willing to terminate his brilliant career by rendering himself the accomplice of those who would condemn the Italians to an eternal servitude."

The Session of the French Chambers was opened on the 7th of February, by the Emperor in person, and his speech, which we give entire, was regarded with no ordinary interest in the threatening aspect of the political horizon. He said:—

"France has, as you are aware, during the last six years seen her welfare augmented, her riches increase, her internal dissensions die out, her influence restored, and yet there arises at intervals in the midst of the general calm and prosperity a vague anxiety, a hollow agitation, which, without any well-defined cause, possesses itself of certain minds, and shakes public confidence.

"I deplore these periodical discouragements without being astonished at them. In a society shattered like ours by so many revolutions, time alone can confirm convictions, give renewed vigour to character, and create a political faith.

"The anxiety which has just been produced, without the appearance of imminent dangers, may justly cause surprise, for it gives evidence at the same time of too much distrust and of too much alarm. A doubt seems to have arisen, on the one hand, of the moderation of which I have given so many proofs, and, on the other, of the power of France. Happily, the great mass of the people is far from sharing such

impressions as these. To-day it is my duty again to explain to you afresh what it seems to have forgotten.

"What has been constantly my policy? To reassure Europe, and to restore to France her real rank, to cement strictly our alliance with England, and arrange with the Continental Powers of Europe the degree of my friendship according to the similarity of our views, and to the nature of their proceedings as regards France.

"It was thus that on the eve of my third election I made at Bordeaux the declaration, '*L'Empire c'est la paix*;' wishing thereby to prove that if the heir of the Emperor Napoleon re-ascended the throne, he would not renew an era of conquests, but would inaugurate a system of peace which could not be disturbed, except for the defence of great national interests.

"As to the alliance of France and England, I have employed all my perseverance to consolidate it, and I have found on the other side of the channel a fortunate reciprocity of sentiments on the part of the Queen of Great Britain, as well as on the part of statesmen of all opinions. To attain the same end, so useful to the peace of the world, I have on every occasion trampled under foot the irritating remembrances of the past, the attacks of calumny, and even the national prejudices of my country.

"This alliance has borne its fruits; not only have we acquired together a lasting glory in the East, but again at the extremity of the world we have just thrown open an immense empire to the

progress of civilization and of the Christian religion.

"Since the conclusion of peace, my relations with the Emperor of Russia have assumed the character of the most frank cordiality, because we have been in accord on all points under dispute.

"I have equally to congratulate myself on my relations with Prussia, which have never ceased to be animated by mutual goodwill.

"The Cabinet of Vienna and mine, on the contrary, I say it with regret, have often found themselves at variance on questions of principle, and a great spirit of conciliation was required to succeed in solving them. Thus, for instance, the reorganization of the Danubian Principalities could only be effected after numerous difficulties, which have hindered the full satisfaction of their most legitimate desires; and if I were asked what interest France has in those distant countries which the Danube waters, I should reply that the interest of France is everywhere where there is a just and civilizing cause to promote.

"In this state of things, there is nothing extraordinary that France should draw closer to Piedmont, which had been so devoted during the war, so faithful to our policy during peace. The happy union of my well-beloved cousin Prince Napoleon with the daughter of King Victor Emmanuel is not one of those unusual events for which one must seek some hidden reason, but the natural consequence of the community of interests of the two countries, and of the friendship of the two Sovereigns.

"For some time past the state of Italy and her abnormal position, where order cannot be maintained except by foreign troops, has justly disquieted diplomacy. This is, however, not a sufficient motive for believing in war. Let some invoke it with all their hearts, without legitimate reasons; let others, in their exaggerated fears, amuse themselves by showing to France the dangers of a new coalition; I shall remain firm in the path of right and justice, and of the national honour; and my Government will not allow itself either to drift or to fear, because my policy will never be provoking nor pusillanimous.

"Away then with these false alarms, these unjust suspicions, these interested apprehensions! Peace, I hope, will not be disturbed. Resume, then, calmly the usual course of your labours.

"I have explained to you frankly the state of our foreign relations, and this explanation corresponds with everything which I have endeavoured to make known during the last two months.

"At home as well as abroad you will, I flatter myself, find that my policy has never ceased for one moment to be the same—firm, but conciliatory.

"Therefore, I reckon with confidence upon your assent, as well as upon the support of the nation, which has intrusted her fate to me. She knows that my actions will never be guided by personal interest or petty ambition.

"When one ascends the steps of a throne supported by the voice and feeling of the people, he rises by the discharge of the weightiest of all responsibilities,

far above that infamous region where vulgar interests are debated; and the first motives of his actions, as his last judges, are—God, his conscience, and posterity!"

With the view, if possible, of solving by the peaceful efforts of diplomacy the difficulties which surrounded the Italian question, and of obtaining concessions from Austria, which would arrest a collision between that Power and France in league with Sardinia, the British Government addressed itself to the Sardinian Government through our Minister at Turin, and requested it to state what the specific complaints were which the Italians had to make against the conduct of Austria, either on account of her dominion over the provinces which she held by virtue of treaties, or in consequence of her relations with the States of Central Italy.

To this appeal the Sardinian Government replied in a long and ably-written memorandum; and we will quote some of the most important passages which contain what may be called the case of Sardinia and the Duchies against Austria.

"It is a fact that Austrian domination inspires a feeling of the most invincible repugnance in the minds of the immense majority of the Italian people who are subjected to it; and, also, that the only feeling which they entertained towards the Government is that of antipathy and hatred.

"From what does this proceed? The Austrian mode of governing has doubtless contributed to it. Her bureaucratic pedantry—the vexatious conduct of her police—the overwhelming taxes which

she has established—her system of recruitment, which is more severe than any other in Europe—and her rigours and her violence, even against women—have exercised the most disastrous effects on her Italian subjects. This, however, is not the principal cause of the evils which have often been pointed out.

“History furnishes us with many examples of governments which are worse than that of Austria, but less universally detested.

“The true cause of the deep discontent of the Lombardo-Venetians is that of being ruled and domineered over by foreigners, by a nation with which they have no analogy either of race, of habits, tastes, or languages. . . .

“During a certain time the firm and independent conduct of the Austrian Government towards the Court of Rome tempered the disastrous effect of foreign domination. The Lombardo-Venetians felt released from the rule which the Church exercised in other parts of the Italian peninsula over the actions of civil life, and even in the sanctuary of families. This was for them a compensation to which they attached the highest value.

“This has been taken from them by the last Concordat, which, as is notoriously well known, secured to the clergy a greater influence and more ample privileges than in any other country, even in Italy, with the exception of the Papal States. . . .

“It is only sufficient to go through Lombardy and Venetia to acquire the conviction that the Austrians are not established, but simply encamped, in those provinces. All houses, from the

humblest cottage to the most sumptuous palace, are closed against the agents of the Government. In the public places, the theatres, the *cafés*, and in the streets, there is a complete line of separation between them and the native inhabitants, and any one would say that it was a country invaded by an enemy's army, rendered the more odious by its insolence and arrogance. This state of things is not a transitory fact produced by exceptional circumstances, and the more or less distant end to which can be predicted; it has endured and gone on aggravating for the last half-century, and it is certain that if the civilizing influence of Europe do not put a stop to it, the attitude of the people towards the Government will grow worse and worse. . . .

“The Treaty of Vienna made over to Austria a large part of Italy, nearly quadrupling the number of her former subjects. In adding to the Duchy of Milan—which belonged to her before the revolution—the Valtellina, the possessions of the Pope situate on the left bank of the Po, and all the States of the Republic of Venice, it has destroyed the equilibrium which existed in the last century. Piedmont, notwithstanding the annexation of Genoa, has no longer been in a state, as formerly, to form a counterpoise to the empire which commands the Po, the Adige, and the principal rivers of Northern Italy.

“Piedmont has thus found herself in presence of a Power reckoning more subjects in Italy than herself, and disposing of forces infinitely more considerable than hers.

“If, however, Austria had kept

herself within the limits assigned by treaties, the rest of Italy would have been able to share in the progress which has been realized in Europe since the termination of the wars of the empire, and to form, with Piedmont, an effectual barrier against foreign influence in the peninsula.

"But Austria has endeavoured, from the first year after the restoration, by every means in her power, to acquire a preponderating influence over the whole of the peninsula.

"By setting herself up as the declared defender of all the Italian Governments, however bad they might be, and interfering with irresistible forces whenever the people sought to obtain improvements and reforms from their own Government, she has succeeded in extending her moral domination far beyond her frontiers. We do not refer to the history of the last forty years, for it is too well known; we confine ourselves to pointing out the present state of things, caused by the persevering action of Austrian policy in Italy generally.

"The Duchies of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany have become real fiefs of the Austrian empire.

"As to the Roman States, the mode of proceeding adopted by Austria has been more simple. She has occupied them whenever political disturbances have furnished her with a pretext for so doing. Since 1831 she has crossed the Po three times, and placed garrisons in the towns of the Romagna. The last occupation has been more complete than the preceding ones, seeing that it extends as far as Ancona, and has lasted for ten years. Although

at this moment the Pontifical Government has demanded the withdrawal of the foreign troops, we do not think that this measure could change the abnormal condition of the States of the Holy See. The departure of these troops, if not preceded by radical reform in all the branches of the Administration, will leave the field open for revolution. Anarchy would be substituted for foreign occupation, to again, and necessarily, have recourse to foreign occupation.

"In our opinion, the danger of a war or revolution would be warded off, and the Italian question, at least temporarily, solved by the following changes:—

"By obtaining from Austria—not in virtue of treaties, but in the name of the principles of humanity and of eternal justice—a national and separate Government for Lombardy and Venetia.

"By requiring, in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Vienna, that the domination of Austria over the States of Central Italy should cease, and, consequently, that the detached forts constructed outside the walls of Placentia should be destroyed; that the Convention of the 21th of December, 1847, should be annulled; that the occupation of the Romagna should cease; and that the principle of non-intervention should be proclaimed and respected,

"By inviting the Dukes of Modena and Parma to give to their people institutions similar to those existing in Piedmont, and that the Grand Duke of

Tuscany should re-establish the constitution to which he had freely consented in 1848.

“By obtaining from the Sovereign Pontiff the administrative separation of the provinces beyond the Apennines, in conformity with the propositions communicated in 1856 to the Cabinets of London and Paris.

“May England obtain the realisation of these conditions! Italy, relieved and pacified, will bless her; and Sardinia, who has so often invoked her co-operation and assistance in favour of her unfortunate fellow-countrymen, will vow to her an imperishable gratitude.”

On the other hand, Austria was not without her grounds of complaint, and these were set forth in a despatch from the Cabinet at Vienna to the Austrian Minister in London at the end of February, which especially addressed itself to the accusations contained in the diplomatic circular issued by Count Cavour. The Austrian Government, through Count Buol, asked:—

“What are the complaints brought against us in Count Cavour's circular? They are to be found in the protests issued by that Minister against the preponderating influence which, according to him, Austria exercises in Italy beyond the limits which treaties have assigned her, and which constitute a permanent menace against Sardinia.

“Let us examine closer this strange accusation. I may be wrong, but I believe it to be in the nature of things that great political bodies will always be called upon to exercise a certain influence on neighbouring States. What is important to the general

interests is that such influence should never be usurped or abused to the detriment of the independence of another State.

“Austria has more than once been in a position to offer a helping hand to the Italian Governments overthrown by revolution. That assistance has never been forced upon any one; on the contrary, it has only been accorded at the request of legitimate authority, and with the disinterested view of maintaining public order and tranquillity. Our troops have always been withdrawn as soon as the legitimate authority has been re-established with sufficient firmness to enable it to dispense with their assistance. Count Cavour need not go far back in the history of his country to find an example of services like these rendered by Austria to the dynasty of Savoy. At that time, it is true, the modern theories of public right which Count Cavour has introduced had not yet taken root in Piedmont.

“We will not stop to examine in detail the absurd reproach that has been urged against us as to the confidence which it is safe for our neighbours to feel in the integrity of our intentions; and what has been added with regard to the treaties which exist between ourselves and certain Italian States does not appear to us to be worthy of any more serious consideration. . . .

“When, only two years after he had ascended the throne, our august master, the Emperor, visited his Italian dominions, marking his way by acts of grace and benevolence, the Piedmontese press redoubled the fury of its attacks, and in its madness even offered a defence of regicide. It

was then that we asked of the Turin Government the simple question, what guarantees it could offer us against the continuation of a state of things so destructive to the good feeling which we wished to subsist between the two Governments; and it is this moderate language which Count Cavour speaks of as an attempt on our part to force upon his Government a modification of the institutions of his country.

"The Emperor's chargé d'affaires was recalled from Turin that he might no longer be an ocular witness of an abnormal state of things which the Piedmontese Government declined to remedy. But this suspension of diplomatic relations did not prevent us from continuing, as before, to concert such measures with the Piedmontese Government as were of a nature to favour and develop intercourse and commercial relations—in a word, friendly relations between the two countries.

"Despite these good intentions and constant moderation, despite our inexhaustible patience, fanatical cries of war were shouted across the Tessin, especially since the commencement of the present year.

"In consequence of the agitation produced by the warlike tone of the Royal speech on the opening of the Piedmontese Parliament—an agitation which the subsequent Ministerial explanations were certainly not calculated to allay—the Imperial Government decided upon sending reinforcements into the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. This measure, dictated by the most common prudence, was one of a purely defensive nature. The

assertion of Count Cavour that it was a hostile movement directed against Sardinia has as little foundation as his other assertion that the garrisons of Bologna and Ancona had been reinforced.

"This is, in a few words, the present position of affairs. In all honour we ask what can we do to improve it? Would it be possible to carry moderation and forbearance further than we have done?

"Let us at once anticipate an objection which we foresee. The discontent of a portion of the populations, especially in Central and Southern Italy, has, we shall be told, its principal source in the mal-administration of the Governments.

"While denying the thousand calumnies by which attempts are made to excite public opinion against those Governments, we do not mean to say that everything is perfect in the organization and administrative system of those countries. Even where the institutions are most excellent, we must allow a wide margin for the imperfect manner in which they are carried out. The most different systems have been practised in turn. In consequence of the introduction of institutions which operate admirably where they have been developed and matured by centuries, but which do not seem to be homogeneous to the mind, traditions, and social condition of the Italians, deplorable scenes of anarchy and disorder have occurred in the Italian peninsula. It was not the counsels of Austria which led to those sad pages of the modern history of Italy. On the other hand, we have always frankly applauded every marked improvement in a

practical point of view; we have always welcomed with satisfaction, and favoured to the utmost of our influence, every well-meant progress. When consulted, we have given our opinion conscientiously, after a mature examination of the circumstances.

"Those measures may not always have produced all the good which might have been expected from them. But who dare throw the whole responsibility upon the acts of the Governments? It is an established truth that in the present day every Government, great or small, has great difficulties to contend against. We have shown above that liberty as understood in Piedmont—a liberty which borders upon licentiousness and a total disregard of the rights of others—is not without serious inconveniences for the neighbouring States. We do not the less admit that Piedmont is the best judge of what system of government is best suited to her. But, however much we may respect its independence, we should not think ourselves justified in imposing on other Italian States a system of government, or pointing out the proper moment for introducing improvements of which that system might be susceptible.

"However this may be, the great argument brought forward against the Papal Government is that it is unable to support itself, and is obliged to rely on foreign assistance. To this we reply that the Cabinet of the Vatican has already entered into negotiations with both Austria and France, with a view to the evacuation of the Papal States by the troops of their countries,

and the gradual regeneration of the Pontifical army.

"By giving armed support to the Sovereign Pontiff, driven away by the revolution, Austria and France rendered a great service to the interests of social order. The temporal sovereignty of the Holy Father is one of the guarantees of the free exercise of his apostolic mission, and of the independence of the spiritual head of the Catholic Church. But when the Pontifical Government shall declare that the reorganization of its army has made sufficient progress to suffice for the wants of order and internal safety, the Emperor, our august master, will be happy to be able to recall his troops, because he will see in this result a new pledge of the paternal solicitude which the Holy Father will devote equally to the successive improvement of other branches of the public service. Austria does not entertain any hostile project against Piedmont. She will abstain, despite the just grievances she might advance in justification, from any aggressive action, so long as, on its part, the Sardinian Government respects the inviolability of the Imperial territory and that of its allies."

The English Government, at the head of which was the Earl of Derby, made the most earnest efforts to avert the calamity of war. We will give some extracts from the correspondence that took place on the subject of the impending quarrel between France and Austria, to show the sincerity of our endeavours, and the soundness of the advice given to the parties who would be involved in the struggle.

On the 10th of January, the Earl of Malmesbury, who was then the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, wrote to Lord Cowley, our Ambassador at Paris, and after stating the deep concern with which Her Majesty's Government had heard of the unsatisfactory state of the relations between the French and Austrian Courts, and that the speech of the Emperor of the French on New Year's day had increased the general alarm, said, "I repeat that I trust to your Excellency to perform this duty, and I hope you will not omit to point out to the French Government that, while no French interest is at stake between France and Austria, there is a State, and there are persons who, to increase its territory and fortify their personal position, ardently desire to involve two powerful empires in a war from which they expect to obtain those results.

"That war, if it be what is expected, namely, an Italian war, can neither be short nor decisive. It may begin as a conflict in which three monarchies are engaged, but looking at the soil on which it will be waged, and the elements which it will contain, it must before long expand into a war of opinions. Among these theories your Excellency may be assured that those of a republican hue will not be the faintest.

"Of such a war France would have to bear the heaviest expenditure of blood and treasure against a foe possessing great military power, and a determination to use it to the last; while the phases of the contest would give new life to that dreaded class who look in anarchy alone

for a realization of their avarice or ambition."

On the 12th, Lord Malmesbury wrote to Lord A. Loftus, our Minister at Vienna, and distinctly intimated that Great Britain would remain neutral in the contest, if war broke out between France and Austria. He said, "It is with sincere pleasure that Her Majesty's Government pay a just tribute to Austria, by admitting that the government of her Italian provinces has been conducted by the Archduke Viceroy with great ability, and in a spirit of conciliation and liberality which does his Imperial Highness the greatest honour. Her Majesty's Government ardently trust that in the interests of the Italians themselves and of the peace of Europe, the Austrian Government will continue to pursue a course which cannot fail to bring to its side the public opinion of impartial and independent States. It appears to Her Majesty's Government to be of paramount importance at this critical moment for Austria to enlist public opinion in her cause, and to take more than common care to avoid every act that could possibly be construed into a wilful offence to those States, who may, perhaps, desire a quarrel with her. Her Majesty's Government, therefore, urge your lordship to take every opportune occasion to impress this truth on the Austrian Government.

"Your lordship will frankly tell Count Buol that should such a struggle as we deprecate be the result of the present estrangement between France and Austria, England would remain a neutral spectator of the contest, and that

in no case would public opinion in this country render it possible for her to assist Austria as against her own subjects, if the contest assumed the aspect of a revolution of her Italian provinces against her Government.

"The public opinion in England has a natural tendency to sympathize with Italian nationalities; but Her Majesty's Government believe that those sympathies would not be aroused to any active form against Austria, unless Austria put herself patently in the wrong, and either became an aggressor, or gave France or Sardinia a fair excuse for beginning a war. . . .

"No one looking at the state of Italy can doubt that many causes of just discontent are to be found in the general administration of the country, and Her Majesty's Government, sympathizing, as they unquestionably do, with the sufferings of the Italian population, would gladly lend their best efforts to produce an amelioration in the existing state of things. But they know that such amelioration can never be effected, with any certainty of permanency, by war. It may produce a change of masters, but it will not confer independence; it may, perhaps, contribute to the elevation of some fortunate individuals, but it will ensure the disorganization of the whole social system, and indefinitely retard the material improvement of the Italian population.

"On the other hand, Her Majesty's Government entertain but little doubt that if Austria and France—the former an Italian, and both Roman Catholic States—laying aside mutual suspicion, were to join heartily with a view

to promote, by peaceful means, the regeneration of Italy, their combined influence would speedily effect a change in the present unhappy state of affairs, and contribute to establish confidence between rulers and their subjects."

And the same determination to remain neuter was strongly expressed by Lord Malmesbury in two despatches, respectively addressed by him on the 13th to Mr. Russell, at Rome, and to Mr. Corbett, at Florence.

"In any such contest, indeed, the part which this country would have to play is sufficiently indicated by its local position, and the general tendency of its political institutions. A war in Italy would not directly affect any material British interests; neither would it be consistent with our political principles to interfere otherwise than by advice in the internal affairs of the Italian States. Therefore, Her Majesty's Government would consider it incumbent upon them to observe the strictest neutrality between the contending parties, and would not see in the struggle, while in progress, or in its result, as long as it should be confined to Italy, any justifiable motive for assuming any other attitude in regard to it than that of a spectator, deeply lamenting, indeed, the calamities which they might witness, but declining any active part in a contest not directly affecting British interests, and begun, as they would consider it, by the chief actors in it without any sufficient cause."

On the 19th of the same month Lord Cowley wrote to Lord Malmesbury, and gave the details of an important conver-

sation which he had just had with the French Emperor. In the course of this conversation the Emperor said, "What I said to M. de Cavour, I repeat now; my sympathies always have been, and still are, with Italy. I regret that Lombardy should be in the possession of Austria, but I cannot and do not dispute the right of the latter. I respect existing treaties, because they are the only landmarks we have; so long as Austria remains within her own frontiers she is, of course, mistress to do as she pleases. With regard to Sardinia, if she provokes hostilities unjustly, and places herself in the wrong, she must expect no support from me."

Lord A. Loftus also communicated the particulars of an interview which he had had with Count Buol, at Vienna, on the same subject.

"If," said Count Buol, "you wish to preach peace and to prevent war, address yourselves with firmness to France and Piedmont. We are not meditating war; we shall not be the aggressors. Tell the Emperor Louis Napoleon, that Great Britain will not passively look on if His Majesty should commence hostilities. Say to him that should he take such a course it will be at his own risk and peril. On the other hand, warn King Victor Emmanuel that England will not sanction any act of wilful aggression, undertaken in full peace, by Piedmont against Austria. If Great Britain is prepared to hold this language, no war will arise."

Lord A. Loftus afterwards said to Count Buol—

"If your Excellency gives me the assurance that in no case will

Austria move a single soldier across her frontier in Italy without previous concert with France, then I shall consider that war may be averted."

"No," said Count Buol, "I cannot give you that assurance, for it would be a surrender of our sovereign power. We should not intervene in any State, unless our aid is asked for, and in that case it will be granted, and the knowledge that it will be granted is the best preservative of order. But let me ask you what you will say to Piedmont if she were to attack us?" Lord A. Loftus answered, "I cannot imagine such an eventuality. It would be a mouse attacking the lion; but I should then say, what I should equally say of you, if you move a soldier across your frontier, that she is the aggressor."

Count Buol then added—

"The truth is, we can never come to an understanding with France on Italian affairs, for we start from two different points:—first, we do not consider France to be an Italian Power; secondly, France sympathizes with and protects the cause of nationalities, whereas we support that of the Sovereigns, Governments, and of established order; therefore there can be no basis on which to found a concert or perfect co-operation. Nor is it necessary. It is a great mistake to think that Italy requires change. If Italy is left quiet, if agitation is put down, and if the hopes of certain parties who only seek their own aggrandizement are annulled, there will be no commotion, no war in Italy, and no cause for the measures which are counselled in the despatch you have read to me."

On the 13th of February Lord Cowley received instructions from the British Government to proceed on a confidential mission to Vienna; and he communicated the results of his negotiations in an interesting despatch, written to Lord Malmesbury, from that capital on the 9th of March. The following are the most important passages in his letter:—

“With respect to the reforms of administration to be introduced into the Roman States, Count Buol expresses himself willing either to resume the negotiation which had been commenced with the French Government upon that subject in 1857, but afterwards allowed to drop by that Government, and not by him, or to fall back upon the recommendations made by the five Powers to the Pope in 1831–32. He prefers the latter measure, because he thinks it more likely to be attended with success. He would not, however, object to the former, but in that case the proposal must come from the French Government. The matter stands thus: France had made certain propositions to Austria, to which counter-propositions had been offered; but Austria had never been able to obtain the opinion of the French Government upon these latter. She had more than once asked for that opinion, and it remained with the French Government to take the next step.

“Upon the third point mentioned in your Lordship’s despatch of the 22nd ult., namely, a security for the better relations between the Governments of Austria and Sardinia, Count Buol says, that your Lordship must address yourself to Turin. It is not, he

maintains, from the conduct of Austria that the present critical state of affairs has arisen, but from the ambitious and encroaching policy of Sardinia. Austria desires no better than to renew those amicable relations which had for so many years united the two Governments, but it could only be done on one condition—a complete change of external policy on the part of the Sardinian Government. With the internal policy of Sardinia Austria has nothing to do, and has no desire to interfere. Count Buol gives the further assurance that Austria, notwithstanding the provocations which she has received, has no intention of attacking Sardinia, as long as the Sardinian troops keep within their own territory; but he insists that as long as Sardinia remains armed there can be no security for peace.

“I come now to the fourth point mentioned in your Lordship’s instructions—namely, the abrogation or modification of the Austro-Italian treaties of 1847. Even on this point, on which Austria is naturally more sensitive than any other, I leave Count Buol not only prepared to act with moderation and forbearance with regard to the actual execution of those treaties, but disposed to examine whether they may be replaced, with the consent of the other contracting parties, by some other combination, which, while relieving Austria from the necessity of an interference, the responsibility of which is fully felt, would not risk the chance of the Duchies becoming a prey to revolution and anarchy.

“In discussing this question, with a view to its practical solution, it was absolutely necessary

to take into consideration the dominant feeling in Count Buol's mind, that the only real danger of revolution to which the Duchies would be exposed would have its source in, and would be supported by, Sardinia. Any scheme, therefore, for replacing the treaties in question, to have a chance of being accepted by Austria, must take this feeling into account. Two plans presented themselves, and were subjects of cursory conversation between Count Buol and myself. The first, to which I avow a strong preference, should it be pursued further, and found practicable, is the recognition by the great Powers, or by Austria and France alone, of the neutrality of the territory of Sardinia; the second is a league among the smaller States of Italy, for their mutual succour in case of internal disorder. Count Buol seemed favourably inclined to take into his consideration any proposal having for its object the modification of the treaties of 1847, based on either of these plans.

"Before quitting altogether the subject of the separate treaties, I may mention that Count Buol considers the secret article in the Austro-Neapolitan treaty of 1815, which binds the King of Naples not to alter the institutions of the kingdom without the permission of Austria, to be a dead letter.

"But, while insisting principally on the four points especially recommended to me by your Lordship's instructions, I have ascertained Count Buol's sentiments on the other matters suggested to me by Count Walewski. I will take them in the order in which they are stated in my

VOL. CI.

despatch of the 16th of February:—

"1. The adoption by all the States of Italy of a system of government which would admit of the taxes being voted by an Assembly of some sort.

"Without making any proposal of this nature, I intimated to Count Buol the expediency of reforms in the administration of these States.

"Count Buol said that the Austrian Government had been much maligned by those who supposed that Austria was opposed to reforms, or had used her influence to prevent them. On the contrary, he could assure me that her advice had ever tended to encourage real ameliorations. He was not, however, one of those who imagined that sweeping measures suited the nature of the Italian people. Austria respected the right of all sovereigns and nations to model their own institutions. There was much of which he could not approve in the constitution of Sardinia, but he had never attempted to interfere with it. On the same principle he had refrained, and would still continue to refrain, from all intervention in the internal affairs of other Italian States, who, however, were not so ill governed as it pleased Sardinia to represent them to be.

"2. Pecuniary aid from all the Roman Catholic States to the Pope, for religious purposes, and the consequent reduction of taxes levied in the Papal States.

"Count Buol did not evince the least disposition to entertain any proposal of the kind.

"Before closing this despatch, I will beg your Lordship's per-

[P]

mission to refer briefly to some of the difficulties with which I have had to contend in carrying out your Lordship's instructions.

"In the first place, I had to encounter a fixed idea that France was determined on war with Austria, and that to make concessions was but to put off the evil day. I hope that I have succeeded in partially removing this impression.

"Secondly, the pride of Austria naturally revolts at being constituted the object of attack, and being called upon to make concessions instigated by the animosity and ambition of Sardinia.

"Thirdly, the attitude assumed by Germany towards France, by which the Austrian Government is naturally anxious to profit.

"And, lastly, there being no real question at issue between Austria and France which can fairly be assumed to involve a *casus belli*.

"I have the satisfaction of adding, in conclusion, that, great as is the irritation which, it cannot be denied, exists at this moment against the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of Austria and his Government render full justice to the services which have been rendered to Europe by the former Sovereign; nor can I doubt that the Austrian Government would accept, with a sincere desire to bring them to an honest conclusion, any overtures for a reconciliation with France, the acceptance of which would not be incompatible with their honour. But as long as Sardinia is allowed to remain armed, I doubt whether Austria will enter into negotiations, since she looks upon the Sardinian army as the advanced guard of

France, permitting the latter to take her own time to arm, and will feel no security that peace is intended so long as that advanced guard is in existence. The disarmament of Sardinia is, therefore, to Austria, the gauge of the sincerity of France. I need hardly add that, upon Sardinia disarming, Austria will take a similar course."

While matters were in this state, the public were suddenly informed by a paragraph in the *Moniteur*, on the 22nd of March, that Russia had proposed the assembling of a Congress, and that France acquiesced in the scheme. The Government journal said:—

"Russia has proposed the meeting of a Congress, with a view to prevent the complications which the state of Italy might give rise to, and which would be of a nature to disturb the peace of Europe. This Congress, consisting of the Plenipotentiaries of France, Austria, England, Prussia, and Russia, should meet in some neutral city. The Government of the Emperor has given its adhesion to the proposition of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg. The Cabinets of London, Vienna, and Berlin have not yet replied officially."

The first difficulty attending this proposal for a Congress arose from the claim of Sardinia, as was natural under the circumstances, to take part in it. The views of Victor Emmanuel's Government on the subject were fully stated by Count Cavour, in a despatch which he addressed, on the 21st of March, to the Marquis d'Azeglio, the Sardinian Minister in London. He said—

"Sardinia has no objection to

make against the meeting of a Congress which, taking into consideration the interests and the just complaints of the Peninsula, would take upon itself to give a pacific and satisfactory solution of the difficulties which deservedly attract the serious attention of Europe. But the Cabinet of Turin believes, at the same time, that Piedmont ought to be represented at this Congress, and it is persuaded that its intervention would be useful, not to say indispensable, if the Powers which show a proved sympathy for Italy, and those which desire to obviate the danger of the abnormal state of the Peninsula, think they can render prevalent a system more conformable to justice by obtaining concessions and guarantees of a nature to calm the public mind.

"Sardinia enjoys the confidence of the unhappy populations whose fate is about to be decided; she has already raised her voice in their favour at the Congress of Paris, and that voice was not only listened to by the most enlightened Governments of Europe, but it has succeeded in calming vexations and angers ready to burst forth; it has disarmed revolution, substituting for it the regular and legal action of diplomacy.

"Sardinia, in taking the lead of the national movement, has always exercised the influence it had acquired to combat openly revolutionary passions; instead of exciting the minds of men soured by suffering and deceptions, it endeavoured to keep them within bounds, and to lead them to a more healthy appreciation of the

events and obstacles which delayed the fulfilment of their legitimate desires. We may openly declare it: if Italy has not been the theatre of new troubles lately, if we have not to deplore insane popular movements, followed by sanguinary reaction, it is to the salutary action and prudent attitude of Piedmont that it must in a great measure be attributed."

Count Buol-Schauenstein, the Austrian Prime Minister, explained the views of his Government on the proposal of Russia, in a note addressed by him to the Russian Minister at Vienna, M. de Balabine, on the 23rd of March. He made it, as will be seen, a preliminary condition that before any Congress assembled Sardinia should disarm. He said,

"Appreciating at their just value the sentiments which have inspired to His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias the overture he has made him make, and desiring to lend his concurrence to a work which must sanction anew the engagements consigned in treaties, and the totality of rights deriving therefrom, the Emperor Francis Joseph accepts on his part the proposition in question.

"In the opinion of the Imperial Cabinet, the whole difficulty resides in the political system which Sardinia follows in her foreign relations. To put an end to this state of things, which alarms Europe, and to prevent its return, such appears to be the task reserved to the Powers called upon in the first rank to uphold social order.

"If, however, besides this question, which the undersigned considers as the only one essentially

[P 2]

important for the moral pacification of Italy, it should enter into the intentions of the Powers to bring forward others for discussion, it would be necessary that they should be exactly stated beforehand, and, insomuch as they should touch upon the internal *régime* of other Sovereign States, the undersigned could not dispense with insisting, above all things, that the mode of proceeding in this case should be conformable to the rules formulated by the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle, under date of the 15th of November, 1818.

"In conclusion, the undersigned must lay stress on a last consideration. To wish to open peaceful deliberations in presence

of the clang of arms and of the preparations for war, would be not only materially dangerous, but morally impossible. It is therefore indispensable, according to the opinion of the Imperial Cabinet, which the undersigned does not doubt will be shared by all the Powers, that previously to all conference, Sardinia must disarm."

And a few days afterwards, he communicated a note to Lord A. Loftus, the British Minister at Vienna, in which he said that his Government "accepted in the measure stated in the sheet thereto annexed, the bases of discussion proposed." The paper here alluded to was the following:—

"English Propositions.

I.

"Means of assuring the maintenance of peace between Austria and Sardinia.

II.

"Evacuation of the Roman States by the foreign corps of occupation, and a taking into consideration of the reforms in the Italian States.

III.

"An arrangement to be substituted for the special treaties between Austria and the Italian States.

"Observations of the Cabinet of Vienna.

"1. The Congress shall examine the means of bringing back Sardinia to the fulfilment of her international duties, and shall consider the measures to be taken to avoid the return of the present complication.

"2. The question of the evacuation of the Pontifical States may be discussed. The Congress will leave the details of its execution to the three Powers directly interested. The question of the administrative reforms may be debated. An understanding may be come to on the advice to be given, but its definitive adoption remains subordinate to the decisions of the States directly interested.

"3. The validity of our treaties cannot be discussed; but if all the Powers represented at the Congress agree among them to

"English Propositions.

"Observations of the Cabinet of Vienna.

produce their political treaties with the Italian States, Austria, on her part, will do the same. She will come to an understanding with the Governments co-interested, in order to be able to present their common treaties to the Congress, and to examine in what measure their revision might be recognized as useful.

IV.

"Territorial arrangements and the treaties of 1815 shall not be touched.

"4. Perfectly agreed that neither existing territorial engagements nor the treaties of 1815, nor those concluded in execution of those acts, shall be touched.

"5. An understanding for a simultaneous disarming of the Great Powers."*

The British Government now made a last proposal, in the faint hope of averting the calamities of war. It addressed to the Four Powers the following propositions:—

"1. That, as a preliminary step, a general and simultaneous disarmament should be effected.

"2. That the said disarmament should be regulated by a military or civil commission, independent of the Congress.

"3. That, as soon as that commission should have met and commenced its task, the Congress should assemble in its turn, and proceed to the discussion of the political questions.

"4. That the representatives of the Italian States should be invited by the Congress, on its meeting, to sit with the representatives of the five great Powers, precisely in the same manner as took place at the Congress of Laybach in 1821."

These proposals appeared in the *Moniteur* on the 21st of April, accompanied with an official declaration, that France, Russia, and Prussia had agreed to the propositions of her Britannic Majesty's Government.

But all further attempts at negotiation were superseded by the precipitate and foolish conduct of Austria, who, at this critical moment, took a step which, under the circumstances, was tantamount to a declaration of war, and made her, in a great measure, responsible for all the disasters which that war brought upon herself.

The attitude of Prussia at this juncture will be best explained by reference to the communications made by the Government

* This fifth proposal was added by Count Buol himself, who said that it "would be, doubtless, received by all the Powers as a new proof of the pacific intentions of Austria."

to the Chambers, the session of which opened in January. On the 28th of April Baron de Schleinitz, the minister for foreign affairs, addressed the Deputies, and said:—

“At the moment when the Prussian Parliament is about to meet after a short respite, events of the most serious nature are taking place far from us. The differences between Austria on the one hand, and Sardinia and France on the other, have now reached a point which leads to the fear that war is inevitable. England has made a last attempt to preserve peace, and all hope is not yet lost. But the Government must own that such hope is very slight. Although, under such circumstances, in the obscurity of the state of things, the Government is not in a position to make a more circumstantial statement to the representatives of the nation, it nevertheless feels it a duty to say what measures it has thought necessary to take.

“Seeing armaments being made everywhere, the Government has for some time been occupied with the measures which ought to be adopted. The hope of the maintenance of peace which lately prevailed, had hitherto prevented it from carrying those measures into execution. Actuated by the sentiment that the welfare of Germany, as well as its own, was at stake, it did not confine itself, independently of other precautionary measures, to placing the *corps d'armée* on a war footing, but it proposed to the German Diet to call out the Federal contingents, and that proposal has been immediately adopted. The Prussian Government is resolved to maintain the

known bases, and it has not deviated from them in the proposition made to the Diet, which bears an essentially defensive character, which responds to the character of the Confederation. The policy of the Government is based more upon the general interests of Germany than upon the interests of Prussia.”

And when the session of the Chambers was closed on the 14th of May by the Regent in person, he thus alluded to the position that Prussia would maintain in the conflict that had then commenced:—

“The war, which my Government in vain used its most strenuous endeavours to prevent, has broken out in Italy. The serious position of affairs demanded the placing of the army on a war footing, which measure it was also found necessary to extend to the marine service. The attitude and spirit of the army are such as to inspire us with full confidence, whatever the future may produce. It will not, when our country calls, fall short of the deeds and fame in arms of our fathers.

“Prussia is determined to maintain the basis of European public right and the balance of power in Europe. It is Prussia's right and duty to stand up for the security, the protection, and the national interests of Germany, and she will not resign the assertion of these her prerogatives.

“Prussia expects that all the German Confederate Powers will stand firmly by her side in the fulfilment of that mission, and trusts that her readiness to defend the common Fatherland will merit their confidence.”

CHAPTER VIII.

WAR IN ITALY CONTINUED—*Summons of Austria to Sardinia to disarm—Reply of the Sardinian Government—Proclamations of King Victor Emmanuel—Views of the British Government—Suspension of the Sardinian Constitution—Statement of Count Walewski to the French Corps Législatif—Address of the Emperor of Austria to his army—His Manifesto to his Subjects—Austrian circular to Foreign Powers—Proclamation of the French Commander at Rome—Events in Tuscany, Parma, and Modena—The Austrian army crosses the Ticino—Advance of the French army into Piedmont—Vindication by the French Government of its Policy—Manifesto of war by the French Emperor—The Empress appointed Regent—Policy of the British Government—The French Emperor's Order of the Day to the army of Italy—Position of the Austrian and Sardinian armies—Military movements—Battle of Montebello—The Austrians retire across the Ticino—Battle of Magenta.*

ON the 23rd of April, Baron de Kellersberg, an aide-de-camp of the Austrian General Gyulai, commanding the army in Lombardy, arrived in Turin, with a summons from the Austrian Government, calling upon Sardinia to disarm, under the threat of immediate hostilities if she refused to comply.

To this peremptory demand, Count Cavour transmitted, on the 26th of April, a reply to Count Buol, at Vienna, in which he said—

“The question of the disarmament of Sardinia, which constitutes the groundwork of the demand which your Excellency addresses to me, has been the subject of numerous negotiations between the great Powers and the Government of His Majesty.

These negotiations have ended in a proposition made by England, to which France, Prussia, and Russia have adhered. Sardinia, in a spirit of conciliation, accepted it without reserve or *arrière-pensée*. As your Excellency cannot be ignorant either of the proposition of England or of the reply of Sardinia, I could not add anything to make known to you the intentions of the Government of the King as regards the difficulties which might prevent the meeting of the Congress.

“The conduct of Sardinia in these circumstances has been appreciated by Europe. Whatever may be the consequences it may lead to, the King, my august master, is convinced that the responsibility will fall upon those who were the first to arm, who

refused the propositions made by a great Power, and deemed just and reasonable by the others, and who now substitute a threatening summons in their stead."

The next day the King, Victor Emmanuel, issued a proclamation to his troops.

"Soldiers!—Austria, who is increasing her armies on our frontier, and threatens to invade our territory because here liberty reigns with order,—because not might, but concord and affection between the people and the Sovereign, here govern the State,—because the groans of oppressed Italy here find an echo,—Austria dares to ask us, who are only armed in self-defence, to lay down our arms and submit to her clemency.

"That insulting demand received the reply it deserved. I rejected it with contempt. Soldiers, I tell it to you, convinced that you will take an insult to your King and to your nation as an insult to yourselves. The announcement I make to you is the announcement of war! Soldiers, to arms!

"You will have to face an enemy not new to you. But if brave and disciplined you need not fear the comparison with them, and you may quote with pride the battles of Goito, Palestrenga, Santa Lucia, Somma-Compagna, and even Custoza, where four brigades alone struggled for three days against five *corps d'armée*.

"I will lead you. We have made each other's acquaintance before this, on more than one occasion, in the heat of battle, when, fighting by the side of my magnanimous father, I had opportunity to admire your courage.

"I am sure that on the field of honour and of glory you will maintain, even add to, your reputation for bravery. You will have for companions those intrepid soldiers of France, conquerors in so many noted battles, who were your brethren-in-arms on the Tchernaya, and whom Napoleon III., who is always to be found where there is a just cause to defend or civilization to promote, sends generously to our assistance in numerous battalions.

"March, then, confident in victory, and twine new laurels round your flag, that tricolor under the folds of which the *élite* of the youth of Italy is collected, and which indicates to you that the task before you is the independence of Italy—that just and holy work which will be your battle-cry."

And at the same time another proclamation was addressed to the Italians, countersigned by Count Cavour:—

"Austria, who boasts of her love for peace, attacks us by refusing to submit to a European Congress. She violates the promises made to England; she asks us to reduce our army, and to abandon those brave volunteers who have thronged from every part of Italy to defend the sacred flag of Italian independence. I intrust the cares of government to my well-loved cousin, and draw my sword.

"Side by side with our soldiers will fight for liberty and justice those valiant troops of the Emperor Napoleon, my generous ally. People of Italy! Austria attacks Piedmont because she maintained the cause of our common country in the councils of

Europe, and because she was not insensible to your groans of agony. Austria now publicly tears to pieces treaties which she never respected. Henceforth, by right, the Italian nation is free, and I may conscientiously fulfil the oath I took upon my father's grave.

"Let us place confidence in Providence, in our union, in the bravery of Italian soldiers, in the alliance of the noble French nation. Let us trust in public opinion. I have no other ambition than to be the first soldier of Italian independence. Long live Italy!"

The rash step taken by Austria in addressing the arbitrary summons to Sardinia to disarm, called forth a strong and emphatic protest from the English Government. On the 22nd of April, Lord Malmesbury wrote to Lord A. Loftus, and said—

"I have acquainted you by the telegraph with the strong feeling of indignation against Austria which prevails in London, in consequence of its having become known that, at the very time that Austria had summoned Sardinia to disarm under penalty of immediate hostilities in case of refusal, Sardinia had actually agreed unconditionally to disarm. Your Lordship's language, therefore, to Count Buol cannot be too strong in regard to the course adopted by Austria.

"Her Majesty's Government are at a loss to imagine on what grounds the Cabinet of Vienna can justify this menace of invasion of Sardinia, now that she has agreed to disarm. It cannot, surely, be justified on the ground of the admission of the representatives of Italian States to the

Congress; for the Austrian Government was itself a consenting party to the admission of them in a certain character, and it is monstrous to suppose that a change in that character, whatever it might be, even supposing it were insisted upon, could warrant Austria in taking the fatal step of an invasion.

"Her Majesty's Government feel, after all that has passed, that they are entitled to expect to be informed on this point; and, in order to bring the question to an immediate issue, you will ask Count Buol whether Austria will stop the march of her armies, and will agree to the admission of the representatives of the Italian States as mere delegates and not as Plenipotentiaries, and will also accept the first three points in my proposals of the 18th inst. relating to disarmament to be effected by commissioners, and to the meeting of the Congress when those commissioners have commenced their labours.

"You will give Count Buol clearly to understand that the refusal of Austria will enlist against her the feelings of the Government and of all classes in this country.

"You will add that, in making this proposal, Her Majesty's Government assume that, if Austria should agree to it, the military operations now in progress in France would at once be arrested.

"As regards, however, the question of Sardinian disarmament, I have to observe that Her Majesty's Government still consider it impossible to call upon the Cabinet of Turin at once to disperse the free corps, as such

a measure would, in all probability, lead to a revolutionary movement in Italy. The wisest course would be to keep them together for a while under the Alps, and to effect their disbandment gradually."

And still stronger language was used in a note which Lord A. Loftus was directed to present to the Austrian Government immediately afterwards:—

"Her Majesty's Government can only now deal with the case as it is presented before them, namely, that Austria has peremptorily summoned Sardinia to disarm, under penalty of immediate war; and the undersigned (Lord A. Loftus) is directed to say that Her Majesty's Government feel it due to themselves and to the great interests of humanity which they have so earnestly striven to uphold, and also to those who have aided them in their endeavours, solemnly to record their protest against the course that Austria, regardless of the terrible consequences to Europe, and indifferent to the public opinion of the world, has so rashly, and, as Her Majesty's Government believe, so unjustly adopted. They assign to Austria and fix upon her the last responsibility for all the miseries and calamities inevitably consequent on a conflict which was on the eve of being averted, but which, once begun, will infallibly produce a more than ordinary amount of social suffering and political convulsion."

On the 25th of April Lord Malmesbury declared that the English Government considered the negotiations for a Congress at an end.

A special meeting of the Sardinian Chamber of Deputies, which had adjourned for the Easter holidays, was now convoked by Count Cavour, who called upon the Chambers to confer upon the king powers which would give him the absolute conduct of affairs as long as the war lasted. And he proposed the following *projet de loi*, which was adopted, and which, in effect, suspended the Sardinian Constitution during the continuance of hostilities:—

"Art. 1.—In case of war with the Austrian empire, the King shall be invested with all the legislative and executive powers, and shall be able, under Ministerial responsibility, to perform by simple Royal decrees all the acts necessary to the defence of the country and of our institutions.

"Art. 2.—The constitutional institutions remaining intangible, the King's Government during the war shall have the faculty of making dispositions for the temporary limitation of the liberty of the press and of individual liberty."

Let us now turn to France. On the 26th of April Count Walewski, the French Foreign Minister, made a long statement to the Corps Législatif in vindication of the policy of the Emperor towards Italy:—

"The state of Italy, aggravated by the administrative measures adopted in the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom, had determined the Austrian Government to make, since last December, armaments which soon assumed a character sufficiently threatening to arouse the most serious alarm in Piedmont.

"The Government of the Emperor did not see those difficulties arise without showing itself anxiously occupied as regards the consequences they might have for the peace of Europe. Not being in the case of intervening directly to propose itself the means to prevent them, it nevertheless eagerly welcomed the overtures which were made to it. Full of confidence in the sentiments of the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, as well as in the intelligence of her Ambassador at Paris, the Government of the Emperor sincerely applauded the mission of Lord Cowley to Vienna as a first attempt of a nature to prepare a *rapprochement*, and it was with no less real satisfaction that it learnt that the ideas exchanged between the Ambassador of England and the Austrian Government were of a nature to provide elements for negotiation.

"The proposition to hold a Congress, presented at the same moment by Russia, responded most happily to that situation, by calling the five Powers to participate equally in the discussion of a question of European interest; the Government of the Emperor did not hesitate to make known that it adhered to that proposition.

"In adhering to it likewise, the English Government deemed it advisable to precisely specify the bases of the eventual deliberations of the Congress. Those bases are:—

"1. To determine the means by which peace may be maintained between Austria and Sardinia.

"2. To establish how the evacuation of the Roman States

by the French and Austrian troops could be best effected.

"3. To examine whether it is suitable to introduce reforms into the internal administration of those States and of the other States of Italy whose administration should offer defects that should tend evidently to create a permanent and dangerous state of trouble and discontent, and what such reforms should be.

"4. To substitute for the treaties between Austria and the Duchies a confederation of the States of Italy between themselves for their mutual protection, internal as well as external.

"The Government of the Emperor displayed as much eagerness in acquiescing without reserve in these bases of negotiation as it had shown in accepting the proposition of a Congress.

"The Austrian Government had, on its side, given its assent to the meeting of a Congress, accompanying it with some observations, but without making formal and absolute conditions, and everything seemed to lead to the hope that the negotiations might shortly be opened.

"The Cabinet of Vienna had spoken of the previous disarmament of Sardinia as of a measure indispensable to insure calmness in the deliberations, and it made it, later, an absolute condition of its participation in the Congress. This demand having given rise to unanimous objections, the Cabinet of Vienna substituted in its stead the proposition of a general and immediate disarmament by adding it as a 5th point to the bases of the negotiations.

"Thus, gentlemen, while France

had successively accepted, without hesitation, all the propositions which had been presented to her, Austria, after having appeared disposed to lend herself to the negotiations, raised unexpected difficulties.

"The Government of the Emperor did not the less persevere in the sentiments of conciliation which it had taken as a guide to its conduct. The English Cabinet, continuing to occupy itself with the most honest solicitude with the means of obviating the delays which the question of the disarmament brought to the meeting of the Congress, had thought that the 5th point brought forward by Austria might be satisfied if the principle of the general disarmament were immediately admitted, agreeing to regulate its execution at the opening itself of the deliberations of the Plenipotentiaries.

"The Government of His Majesty consented to accept that combination. There remained, however, to be determined if, in that state of things, it was necessary that Sardinia herself should subscribe previously to the principle of the general disarmament. It did not appear that such a condition could be imposed upon the Sardinian Government if it was excluded from the deliberations of the Congress; but this very consideration offered elements of a new combination, which, perfectly conformable to the principles of justice, did not seem likely to give rise to objections. The Government of the Emperor declared to the English Government that it was disposed to induce the Cabinet of Turin to give its assent to the principle of the general disarmament, pro-

vided that all the Italian States should be invited to take part in the Congress.

"You are already aware that, modifying that suggestion in a manner to conciliate all susceptibilities, the Government of Her Britannic Majesty presented a last proposition, based upon the principle of a general, simultaneous, and immediate disarmament. The execution thereof was to be regulated by a Commission, in which Piedmont should be represented. The Plenipotentiaries should meet as soon as that Commission should itself have met, and the Italian States should be invited by the Congress to sit with the representatives of the Five Great Powers, in the same manner as at the Congress of Laybach in 1821.

"The Government of the Emperor wished to manifest again its conciliatory disposition by adhering to that proposition, which was also accepted without delay by the Courts of Prussia and Russia, and to which the Piedmontese Government also declared itself ready to conform.

"Yet, at the very moment when the Government of the Emperor thought it might cherish the hope of a definitive understanding, we learnt that the Court of Austria refused to accept the proposition of the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, and addressed a direct summons to the Sardinian Government. While, on the one side, the Cabinet of Vienna persists in not consenting to the admission of the Italian States to the Congress, the meeting of which it thus renders impossible, on the other hand it demands from

Piedmont to place her army on a peace footing, and to disband her volunteers—that is to say, to concede without delay, and to Austria alone, that which it had already granted to the Powers, under the sole reserve of coming to an understanding with them about it. . . .

“In presence of this state of things, if Sardinia is menaced, if, as everything leads it to be presumed, her territory is invaded, France cannot hesitate to respond to the appeal of a nation her ally, to which she is bound by common interests and traditional sympathies, regenerated by a recent confraternity in arms, and by the union contracted between the two reigning Houses.”

On the following day, the 27th of April, the Emperor of Austria sent an address to his army in Lombardy, announcing the commencement of war. He said:—

“After fruitless attempts to secure peace for my empire, without compromising its dignity, I am necessitated to have recourse to arms.

“With confidence I confide the rights of Austria to the best of hands—to the hands of a tried and gallant army.

“Your fidelity and bravery, your exemplary discipline, the justice of the cause which you defend, and a glorious past, guarantee to me your success.

“Soldiers of the Second Army! it is for you to secure victory to the spotless flag of Austria. Take with you into battle the blessing of God and the confidence of your Emperor.”

And two days afterwards he issued an imperial manifesto

announcing his determination to invade Sardinia. It was addressed “To my People,” and was in the following terms:—

“I have ordered my faithful and gallant army to put a stop to the hostile acts which for a series of years have been committed by the neighbouring State of Sardinia against the indisputable rights of my Crown, and against the integrity of the realm placed by God under my care, which acts have lately attained the very highest point. By so doing I have fulfilled the painful but unavoidable duty of a Sovereign. My conscience being at rest, I can look up to an omnipotent God, and patiently await His award. With confidence I leave my decision to the impartial judgment of contemporaneous and future generations. Of the approbation of my faithful subjects I am sure. More than ten years ago the same enemy—violating international law and the usages of war, and without any offence being given—entered the Lombardo-Venetian territory with the intention of acquiring possession of it. Although the enemy was twice totally defeated by my gallant army, and at the mercy of the victor, I behaved generously, and proposed a reconciliation. I did not appropriate to myself one inch of his territory, I encroached on no right which belongs to the Crown of Sardinia, as one of the members of the European family of nations. I insisted on no guarantees against the recurrence of similar events. The hand of peace which I in all sincerity extended, and which was taken, appeared to me to be a sufficient

guarantee. The blood which my army shed for the honour and right of Austria I sacrificed on the altar of peace. The reward for such unexampled forbearance was an immediate continuation of enmity, which increased from year to year, and perfidious agitation against the peace and welfare of my Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom. Well knowing what a precious boon peace was for my people and for Europe, I patiently bore with these new hostilities. My patience was not exhausted when the more extensive measures which I was forced to take, in consequence of the revolutionary agitation on the frontiers of my Italian provinces and within the same, were made an excuse for a higher degree of hostility. Willingly accepting the well-meant mediation of friendly Powers for the maintenance of peace, I consented to become a party to a Congress of the Five Great Powers. The four points proposed by the Royal Government of Great Britain as a basis for the deliberations of the Congress were forwarded to my Cabinet, and I accepted them, with the conditions which were calculated to bring about a true, sincere, and durable peace. In the consciousness that no step on the part of my Government could, even in the most remote degree, lead to a disturbance of the peace, I demanded that the Power which was the cause of the complication and had brought about the danger of war should, as a preliminary measure, disarm. Being pressed thereto by friendly Powers, I at length accepted the proposal for a general disarmament. The mediation

failed, in consequence of the unacceptableness of the conditions on which Sardinia made her consent dependent. Only one means of maintaining peace remained. I addressed myself directly to the Sardinian Government, and summoned it to place its army on a peace footing, and to disband the free corps. As Sardinia did not accede to my demand, the moment for deciding the matter by an appeal to arms has arrived.

"I have ordered my army to enter Sardinia.

"I am aware of the vast importance of the measure, and if ever my duties as a monarch weighed heavily on me it is at this moment. War is the scourge of mankind. I see with sorrow that the lives and property of thousands of my subjects are imperilled, and deeply feel what a severe trial war is for my realm, which, being occupied with its internal development, greatly requires the continuance of peace. But the heart of the monarch must be silent at the command of honour and duty. On the frontiers is an armed enemy, who, in alliance with the revolutionary party, openly announces his intention to obtain possession of the dependencies of Austria in Italy. To support him the ruler of France—who, under futile pretexts, interferes in the legally established relations of the Italian Peninsula—has set his troops in movement. Detachments of them have already crossed the frontiers of Sardinia. The Crown, which I received without spot or blemish from my forefathers, has already seen trying times. The glorious history of our country gives evidence that Providence,

when there is a foreshadowing that the greatest good of humanity is in danger of being overthrown in Europe, has frequently used the sword of Austria in order to dispel that shadow. We are again on the eve of such a period. The overthrow of the things that be is not only aimed at by factions, but by thrones. The sword which I have been forced to draw is sanctified, inasmuch as it is a defence for the honour and rights of all peoples and States, and for all that is held most dear by humanity.

"To you, my people, whose devotion to the hereditary reigning family may serve as a model for all the nations of the earth, I now address myself. In the conflict which has commenced you will stand by me with your oft-proved fidelity and devotion. To your sons, whom I have taken into the ranks of the army, I, their commander, send my martial greeting. With pride you may regard them, for the eagle of Austria will, with their support, soar high.

"Our struggle is a just one, and we begin it with courage and confidence. We hope, however, we shall not stand alone in it. The soil on which we have to do battle was made fruitful by the blood lost by our German brethren when they won those bulwarks which they have maintained up to the present day. There the crafty enemies of Germany have generally begun their game when they have wished to break her internal power. The feeling that such a danger is now imminent prevails in all parts of Germany, from the hut to the throne, from one frontier to the

other. I speak as a Sovereign member of the Germanic Confederation when I call attention to the common danger, and recall to memory the glorious times in which Europe had to thank the general and fervent enthusiasm of Germany for its liberation.

"For God and fatherland!

"Given at my residence and metropolis of Vienna, on this 28th day of April, 1859.

"FRANCIS JOSEPH."

At the same time, Count Buol, the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, addressed a circular to the diplomatic agents of his Government abroad, in which he reviewed and defended the conduct of Austria. We will quote a few of the principal passages:—

"Austria has tranquilly supported a long series of offences from an enemy weaker than herself, because she knows that her high mission is to preserve as long as possible the peace of the world, because the Emperor and his people know and love the labours of a progressive pacific development, which leads to a higher degree of prosperity. But no man of just mind and of upright heart can now doubt the right which Austria has to make war on Piedmont.

"Piedmont has never sincerely accepted the treaty by which, ten years ago, she promised at Milan to live in peace and friendship with Austria. Twice beaten in war, which had been caused by her mad pretensions, and although she had been cruelly punished, that State still maintains her former views with a deplorable tenacity. The son of Charles Albert appears passionately to desire the day when the

inheritance of his house, which had been restored to him in its integrity by the moderation and magnanimity of Austria, should be for the third time made the stake of a game disastrous to the world.

"The ambition of a dynasty whose vain pretensions touching the future welfare of Italy are neither justified by the nature nor by the history of that country, has not hesitated to form an unnatural alliance with revolution. Deaf to all warnings, it has surrounded itself with the malcontents of all the States of Italy, and the hopes of all the enemies of the legitimate governments of the Italian Peninsula have found their chief support at Turin. A criminal abuse has been made of the national feelings of the Italian people. Endeavours have been made to keep up and encourage disturbances in Italy in order that Piedmont might have a pretext for hypocritically deploring the state of Italy, and assuming in the eyes of short-sighted and senseless people the part of a liberator.

"To assist this rash undertaking, an unbridled press every day endeavoured to carry beyond the frontiers of the neighbouring States a moral insurrection against the order of legitimate things; this state of things no country in Europe could tolerate without exposing itself in the end to deep and dangerous excitement. Out of love for those hollow dreams of the future, and in order to secure to herself support from abroad, Piedmont took part in a war in which she had no concern against a foreign power, and sacrificed her soldiers for a foreign object. She was also seen

at the Conferences of Paris, with a presumption quite new in the annals of diplomacy, to criticize with effrontery the Governments of Italy, her own country—Governments which had never offended her.

"Austria is a conservative Power, with whom religion, morality, and historical right are sacred. It knows how to estimate, to protect, and to weigh in the scales of equality, what is noble and legitimate in the national spirit of nations. Her extensive dominions consist of different races, of different languages; the Emperor embraces them all in the same love, and their union under the sceptre of our august dynasty is advantageous to the whole of the great family of European nations; but the pretension of forming new States, according to the limits of nationalities, is the most dangerous of all utopian schemes.

"To put forward such a pretension is to break with history; and to seek to carry it into execution in any point of Europe is to shake to its foundations the firmly organized order of States, and to threaten the Continent with subversion and chaos. Europe feels this, and she attaches herself the more firmly to the territorial divisions fixed by the Congress of Vienna at the close of an epoch of continental wars with as much regard as possible to historical conditions. There is not a power whose possessions are more legitimate than those in Italy restored to the house of Hapsburg by the Congress which re-established the kingdom of Sardinia, and made it the brilliant present of Genoa.

"Lombardy has been for cen-

turies a fief of the empire of Germany; Venice was given to Austria in exchange for her giving up her Belgian provinces. Thus, therefore, what the Cabinet of Turin calls the true reason of the discontent of the inhabitants of Lombardo-Venetia, showing thereby itself the utter want of foundation for its other alleged grievances, namely, the domination of Austria on the Po and on the Adriatic, is a solid and unquestionable right in every respect, and one which the Austrian eagles will preserve from all attack. But it is not only a legitimate Government—it is a just and benevolent one—which administers the Lombardo-Venetian provinces. Those beautiful countries have prospered more rapidly than could have been hoped after the long and painful years of revolution; Milan and several other celebrated towns display wealth worthy of their history; Venice is recovering from her profound decline, and displaying new life; the administration of justice is regular, manufactures and commerce prosper, science and art are cultivated with ardour. The public burdens are not heavier than in other parts of the monarchy; they would even be lighter if the fatal effects of Sardinian policy did not require that the State should augment its forces, and consequently raise new revenues. The great majority of the people of Lombardy and Venetia are content; the number of the discontented who have forgotten the lessons of 1848 is small in comparison; and it would be less without the incessant excitations of Piedmont.

“But France, which for a long

time past, we repeat, has shared that terrible moral responsibility,—France has hastened by her acts to assume it altogether. The Government of the Emperor of the French caused, on the 26th of this month, his *Chargé d’Affaires* at Vienna to declare that he should consider the passage of the Ticino by the Austrian troops as a declaration of war against France. While we were still waiting at Vienna for the reply of Piedmont to the summons to disarm, France caused her troops to enter Sardinia by the land and sea frontiers, knowing well that by so doing she placed in the balance the weight which would carry the last resolutions of the Court of Turin.

“And why, we ask, were the legitimate hopes of the friends of peace in Europe thus to be annihilated by a single blow? Because the time had arrived at which projects long meditated in silence have arrived at maturity—at which the second French Empire desires to give substance to its *ideas*—at which the political state of Europe, based on right, is to be sacrificed to its illegitimate pretensions—at which the treaties which form the basis of public European power are to be replaced by the *political wisdom* which the Power which rules at Paris has announced to the astonished world.

“The traditions of the first Napoleon are resumed. Such is the signification of the struggle on the eve of which Europe is placed.”

It may be easily imagined that the events which were passing in the North of Italy excited the liveliest sympathy in the minds of the population of Rome. But

[Q]

the French Emperor had enough on his hands without wishing to embroil himself with the Papal Court, and he therefore directed General de Goyon, who commanded the French troops at Rome, to repress all popular manifestations there. The general accordingly issued the following significant notice on the 26th of April:—

“Peaceable but public manifestations have taken place. Whatever may be our sympathy with the sentiments which have been expressed, we cannot allow them to be repeated. Any public manifestation is a breach of order; no matter under what colour or motive it is made, it involves disagreeable consequences upon those who instigate it.

“The law forbids all gatherings, and orders, if necessary, their dispersion by force. Here, by order of our Emperor, to assist the venerable and venerated Holy Father, by facilitating to his Government the maintenance of order, it is my duty, as commander of the public force, to enforce the law. This duty, however painful it may be, shall be accomplished by us in every circumstance; but I rely upon the intelligent and prudent feelings of the Roman public to make my task more easy.”

In Tuscany, the revolution broke out at Florence, on the 27th of April. The Grand Duke was exceedingly unpopular, not only from his known Austrian sympathies, but the illiberal character of his government. At an early hour on the day above mentioned, an immense crowd of people assembled in the Piazza Santa Maria Antonia, and raised the tricolour flag, which, in less

than an hour, was seen floating over the tower of the Palazzo Vecchio and the fortresses of San Giorgio and San Giovanni. General Ferrari, who commanded the Tuscan troops, had already, on the previous day, sent in his resignation. The Grand Duke was advised by his ministers to abdicate in favour of his son, but he declared that he would rather abandon his dominions than take such a step. And he proved the sincerity of this assertion by quitting Florence with his family in the evening, upon which there appeared next morning a proclamation from the municipality, announcing that, as the Grand Duke and his Government, rather than satisfy the just demands of the country, had abandoned it to itself, the municipality of Florence, “the only element of authority that still exists,” had appointed a provisional government. This body continued to administer public affairs until the 11th of May, when it resigned its functions to Signor Buoncompagni, a commissioner extraordinary appointed for the purpose by the King of Sardinia, with the full approbation of the people of Tuscany. In assuming this office, Signor Buoncompagni addressed a proclamation to the Tuscans, in which he said:—

“When the Prince who reigned in Tuscany, sooner than adopt the wishes of his nation, had abandoned the State, the Provisional Government in your name invited the King Victor Emmanuel to assume, during the war, the dictatorship of this beautiful part of Italy. The King seconding in substance your desires, preferred the adoption of a more

modest form, and assumed, with the supreme command of the army, the protectorate of Tuscany, with the intention of maintaining intact all its rights, and with the sole object of providing for the emergencies of war, defending public order, and carrying out all those public acts which are required by the urgent necessities of the State. He has thought fit to commit to me the task of representing him among you My administration, then, shall have one aim, that of facilitating the conduct of the present war, and with this object the maintenance of order in the State, which at the termination of the war shall be restored to you as a sacred deposit by his Majesty King Victor Emmanuel, whose loyal conduct is the object of the admiration of Italy and the world."

The Commissioner Extraordinary then appointed the following ministers:—Il Barone Bettino Ricasoli, Minister of the Interior; Il Marchese Cosimo Ridolfi, Minister of Public Instruction; Enrico Poggi, Minister of Justice; Raffaello Busacca, Minister of Finance; Avv. Vincenzo Malenchini, Minister of War. The Marchese Cosimo Ridolfi was to act provisionally as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Enrico Poggi as Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs.

Of the Governments of the three duchies, Tuscany, Modena, and Parma, that of Parma was incomparably the best. The Duchess-Regent (sister to the Duc de Bourdeaux, and widow of the murdered Duke) had administered her dominions with liberality and skill, and personally she was beloved by her subjects.

But the contagious passion for annexation to Piedmont had seized the inhabitants, and they were determined to take part in the great struggle that was going on for Italian liberty. On the 1st of May the populace assembled in crowds in front of the royal palace, and the officers of the army demanded the union of their troops with the Piedmontese forces. In consequence of this the Duchess and her sons quitted Parma, after having first appointed a council of regency composed of her Ministers. She returned, however, in a few days, and issued a proclamation, in which she said:—

"The disturbances which took place on the first of this month, although accomplished contrary to the will of the immense majority of faithful citizens, who rarely express their loyal and excellent intentions away from their own homes, only too clearly justify my maternal foresight in protecting the safety of my beloved children. But the sentiments of fidelity which have been manifested by the Royal troops in the rapid overthrow of the illegitimate and intruding authority having restored power to my Governmental Commission, and having done so in accord with the unanimous desire of the constituted authorities of the municipality, and of the notable inhabitants of the country, and an ardent wish for my return having been unanimously expressed, I have immediately come among you to resume the exercise of the regency. And now I confide, with assurance and courage, in the loyalty of the troops and the population. I shall remain in the expectant attitude

[Q 2]

which is of absolute necessity to us. This attitude, which is permitted to me by the real spirit of treaties, must be the best protection of the country, the justice and courtesy of belligerent Powers not suffering a State to be attacked which does not attack, and which accomplishes its duty of maintaining order until Europe in its wisdom shall have taken resolutions which shall restore peace and re-establish it permanently."

But this was only a temporary resumption of power. The tide of popular sympathy with the Piedmontese movement flowed too strongly to be resisted, and the Duchess-Regent was again compelled to leave her dominions. She behaved, however, with dignity and prudence in the difficult circumstances in which she was placed. Instead of flying from her capital as a fugitive to the Austrians, like the Grand Dukes of Tuscany and Modena, she determined to retire openly to a neutral territory during the continuance of the war, as she felt that she could not discharge her duties as a sovereign in her own dominions during the complications to which that war had given birth. But she first authorized the municipality of Parma to appoint a Commission to govern the country during her absence, and on the 9th of June she issued the following proclamation:—

"I invoke the testimony of you all, the inhabitants of this State, and of history, as to what has been the government of my reGENCY.

"More fervent ideas, flattering to Italian minds, have come to interfere with the pacific and wisely liberal progress to which

all my care was directed; and the events which now come to pass have placed me between two contrary exigencies—to take part in a declared war of nationality, and not to act in opposition to the conventions to which the whole State, and Piacenza more especially, were already subjected long before I assumed the government.

"It is my duty neither to go against the proclaimed wishes of Italy nor to be wanting in good faith. Therefore, it being impossible to maintain the neutral situation which seemed to be counselled by the exceptional conditions made for the territory by those conventions, I yield to the pressure of events, recommending to the Parmesan municipality the nomination of a Commission of Government for the preservation of order, of persons, and of things, for the public administration, for the proper destination of the Royal troops, and for the other measures which may be enjoined by circumstances.

"And I withdraw into a neutral country, to my beloved children, whose rights I declare that I reserve entire and intact, confiding them to the justice of the high Powers and to the protection of God.

"Good people of all the communes of the Duchy, everywhere and always, the remembrance of you will remain grateful to my heart."

After the war had broken out the territory of the Duchy of Modena was occupied by Sardinian troops in Masse, Carrara, and Montignolo, and the Duke protested against the act as contrary to the treaties of 1815. His protest, however, was disregarded,

and on the 11th of June he issued a proclamation to his subjects in which he declared that, unwilling to expose his people to the evils of an unavailing contest, he had decided upon quitting his dominions, and he constituted a regency to govern the country in his absence. Both he and the Duke of Tuscany joined the Austrian camp.

The advanced posts of the Austrian army crossed the Ticino by the bridge of Buffalora on the 26th of April, and were followed on the 29th by a portion of the 5th corps which crossed at Pavia, and by the 7th corps which effected a passage across the river on a pontoon bridge at Bereguardo, next day.

On the following day, the 30th, the 5th corps, under Count Stadion, passed the same bridge, and the 8th corps, under General Benedict, crossed at Pavia; the 7th pushing on to Mortara, and the 3rd to Garlasco.

On the 1st of May the 2nd corps, under Prince Lichtenstein, crossed at Pavia, so that it took several days for the whole five *corps d'armée* to cross the Ticino.

On the night of the 1st of May the line extended along the Agogna river from Vespola on the north to San Nazzaro, and thence to the eastward along the Po; the 3rd corps keeping the centre, with the 5th and 7th on its right, and the 8th and 2nd on its left. The line was gradually advanced and extended in this order until May 8th, when the head-quarters of the Commander-in-Chief, General Gyulai, were at Vercelli, and the whole country north of the Po as far as Biella and Craglia on the north-west, and the Dora Baltea on the west,

was occupied by the Austrians almost without opposition.

It should be mentioned that the Po was at this period swollen in an unusual degree, and the waters not only of it but of the Ticino and the Sesia had risen to such a height as to make military manœuvres dependent on crossing those rivers extremely difficult.

The French army destined to act in Italy was divided into five corps, consisting of infantry and cavalry; and to these were added the Imperial Guard.

It was put in motion on the 23rd of April, the same day on which news was telegraphed to Paris that Austria had sent an *ultimatum* to Piedmont, and this was afterwards alleged by Austria as a justification of her invasion of the Piedmontese territory, on the ground that France had first commenced actual hostilities by sending her troops into Italy.

The 1st corps was commanded by Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, the 2nd by General M'Mahon, the 3rd by Marshal Canrobert, the 4th by General Niel, the 5th by Prince Napoleon, and the Imperial Guard by General Saint Jean d'Angély. The 3rd and 4th corps received orders to enter Piedmont by the passes of the Alps—the 3rd marching across the Mont Cenis to Susa, from which there is a railway to Turin; and the 4th by way of Grenoble, across the Col de Genevre, also to Susa—and the advanced columns of these two corps reached Turin on the same day, the 30th of April. The 1st and 2nd corps and the Imperial Guard embarked at Marseilles and Toulon, and were conveyed by sea direct to Genoa.

When the French Government heard that the Austrians had crossed, or were upon the point of crossing, the Ticino, and invading the territory of Sardinia, Count Walewski, the Foreign Minister, addressed a despatch to M. de Banneville, on the 29th of April, which was communicated by the Duc de Malakhoff to Lord Malmesbury on the 5th of May, and in which the French Minister thus vindicated the conduct of France:—

“The Government of the Emperor,” he said, “assuredly has not to justify the solicitude with which the state of things in Italy inspired it. The crisis which has now come in the centre of the peninsula gives but too much cause for our foresight; and it has, in fact, sufficed to us to make known our apprehensions, in order that the great Powers of Europe might share in them to the same degree as ourselves. This simultaneous agreement of the Cabinets, in face of a danger which they all had for some years secretly foreseen, proves how ripe the question seemed to them. We have the proud conviction that the Congress assembled under the conditions which the Cabinet of St. Petersburg had proposed for its convocation, and confining itself to the plan traced out for its deliberations by the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, would have fully resolved the difficulties which prudence no longer permitted to be left unheeded.

“Who could now doubt that the rock on which the work of conciliation split was the pretension put forward by the Court of Vienna on the subject of a disarmament, of which it would pro-

bably have been more just and more true to say that that Court had to give the example?

“Had not Sardinia, in fact, accepted, without any after-thought, the situation which would result for her from the terms of the Russian proposition, and if military preparations had already been effected upon her territory, besides that the disproportion of forces made all aggression on her part inadmissible, did not the most obvious reasons impose upon her the duty of waiting quietly for the decision of the great Powers? No guarantee, in a word, was more real or more complete for Austria than the immediate assembly of the Congress; and if the first condition, of which she demanded the fulfilment before answering the appeal of the Allies, a condition considered unacceptable by all the world, gave rise subsequently to combinations which she was the first to reject, it is permitted to me to state that at the beginning, as well as at the end, the obstacle to the harmony which was the wish of the other Courts was only encountered at Vienna.

“The situation acquired, no doubt, through so many delays, an importance which became more and more serious, but the bond of good intentions which had been formed and maintained itself to the end between the Cabinets of Paris, Berlin, London, and St. Petersburg, opposed, so to say, its resistance to the perils of this situation. Nothing was irremediably compromised, when Austria, not satisfied with refusing its consent to the last propositions of England, took the step of addressing to Turin a summons, at brief notice, which must

perforce have altered our attitude.

"The Government of the Emperor would only see in the general position of the affairs of Italy a great European question, the settlement of which demanded the co-operation of all its allies. These affairs, nevertheless, were bound up, on one side only, with interests which concerned it in a more personal and particular manner. Austria herself, in promising not to begin hostilities against Piedmont, recognized by implication the existence of a limit which the most lively desire for a peaceful solution could not allow us to let her go beyond.

"The Government of the Emperor had besides announced that if it did not sustain Sardinia in an aggressive attempt, it would give her its support for defensive measures. This engagement entailed an obligation from which the Court of Vienna only could exempt us.

"Informed of the menace which weighed upon Piedmont at such brief notice, we were obliged in so short a space to put ourselves in a position to mitigate its consequences; and upon the demand of His Majesty the King of Sardinia, the advanced guard of the French army entered his territory. Sympathies which we do not hesitate to proclaim would have with difficulty permitted us to remain indifferent to the trials of a country in close relations with France, but more positive reasons influenced our conduct when that country was our near neighbour, marched with one of our frontiers, and formed the last obstacle to the extension of an influence which England, Prussia, and Russia, like us, looked upon as being already of a nature either to com-

promise the equilibrium of Europe, or to keep up in that part of Italy of which it had been intended to constitute independent and sovereign States, a perpetual cause of agitation and confusion."

On the 3rd of May the French Emperor directed a communication to be made to the Corps Législatif, which amounted to a manifesto of war. He said,—

"Austria, in causing her army to enter the territories of the King of Sardinia, our ally, declares war against us. She thus violates treaties and justice, and menaces our frontiers. All the great Powers have protested against this aggression. Piedmont having accepted the conditions which ought to have insured peace, one asks what can be the reason of this sudden invasion? It is that Austria has brought matters to this extremity, that she must either rule up to the Alps, or Italy must be free to the shores of the Adriatic; for in this country every corner of territory which remains independent endangers her power.

"Hitherto moderation has been the rule of my conduct; now energy becomes my first duty. Let France arm, and resolutely tell Europe:—'I desire not conquest, but I desire firmly to maintain my national and traditional policy. I observe the treaties on condition that no one shall violate them against me. I respect the territories and the rights of neutral Powers, but I boldly avow my sympathies for a people whose history is mingled with our own, and who groan under foreign oppression.'

"France has shown her hatred of anarchy. She has been pleased to give me a power

strong enough to reduce into nonentity the abettors of disorder and the incorrigible members of those old factions whom one incessantly sees confederating with our enemies; but she has not for all that abdicated her task of civilization. Her natural allies have always been those who desire the improvement of the human race, and when she draws the sword it is not to dominate, but to liberate. The object of this war, then, is to restore Italy to herself, not to impose on her a change of masters, and we shall then have upon our frontiers a friendly people, who will owe to us their independence. We do not go into Italy to foment disorder or to disturb the power of the Holy Father, whom we have replaced upon his throne, but to remove from him this foreign pressure, which weighs upon the whole Peninsula, and to help to establish there order based upon legitimate satisfied interests. We are going, then, to seek upon this classic ground, illustrated by so many victories, the footsteps of our fathers. God grant that we may be worthy of them! I am going soon to place myself at the head of the army. I leave in France the Empress and my son. Seconded by the experience and the enlightenment of the last surviving brother of the Emperor, she will understand how to show herself equal to the grandeur of her mission. I confide them to the valour of the army which remains in France to watch our frontiers and to protect our homes; I confide them to the patriotism of the National Guard; I confide them, in a word, to the entire people, who will encircle them with that affection and devotion

of which I daily receive so many proofs. Courage, then, and union! Our country is again about to show the world that she has not degenerated. Providence will bless our efforts, for that cause is holy in the eyes of God which rests on justice, humanity, love of country, and independence."

At the same time an Imperial decree appeared in the *Moniteur*, conferring upon the Empress the title and authority of Regent during the Emperor's absence at the theatre of war. She was also to preside in his name at the Privy Council and at the Council of Ministers, but she was directed to take, on the resolutions and decrees submitted to her, the counsel of Prince Jerome Napoleon, the uncle of the Emperor, who in her absence was to preside at the Council of Ministers.

After the war had broken out, Lord Malmesbury repeated to the Cabinet of Vienna the firm determination of the British Government to observe a strict neutrality. He wrote to Lord A. Loftus on the 4th of May:—

"As far as England is concerned, there are no immediate interests which necessitate any direct action on her part, and Her Majesty's Government feel it to be their duty to maintain a strict neutrality between the belligerents. This is also the feeling of the people of England, and it is obvious that any other course at present would tend to complications which can scarcely yet be foreseen."

And in a despatch to Lord Cowley, on the 5th of May, the English Minister entered at considerable length into a review of the conduct of Austria and Sardinia, and did not shrink from expressing strong

disapprobation of the policy in some particulars of both. We will give a few extracts from the letter, which we think reflects credit upon the British Government, and is a proof of the impartial fairness with which it held the scales between the contending parties:—

“Her Majesty’s Government believe that it was never intended by Europe, when recognizing the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom as a portion of the dominions of the House of Austria, that Austria should, as a consequence of that recognition, be at liberty to extend her moral and material sway over all other portions of the peninsula. It never was intended that Austria should constantly and systematically interfere beyond her frontier; that she should at will influence the internal administration, and occupy by her armies the territories of other Italian States, whose independence was recognized by the same treaties. It never was intended that the progress of freedom and of social improvement in the Italian States should be left to the control of Austria.

“But if Her Majesty’s Government do not shut their eyes to the defects of the system upon which Austria has acted in Italy, and which could hardly fail, sooner or later, to entail upon Austria a fearful unpopularity, and upon Italy the concomitant miseries of a social or of a foreign war, neither can they hold Sardinia blameless for the course she has pursued in these latter times, and which has now produced its certain and lamentable results.

“Her Majesty’s Government have hitherto always looked with

satisfaction on the progress which Sardinia was making, as affording a bright example, to be imitated hereafter by other Italian States, of the benefits which result to the Sovereign and to the subjects from the adoption of a wise and liberal system of administration.

“If Sardinia could have contented herself with the improvement of her own material prosperity, by developing the natural advantages of her position, and with the liberal system of administration which she so wisely adopted, and which she has so consistently maintained, she would have been a landmark to the rest of Italy, and respected by the whole world, and would by her moral force have been unassailable. Under these circumstances, and with such a policy, Her Majesty’s Government have no reason to believe that she would have been molested by her powerful neighbour.

“It was in an evil hour for herself and for Europe that Sardinia lent herself to dreams of ambition and aggrandizement, and, forgetful of the little sympathy shown in 1848 by the Milanese for her cause, and their ingratitude for her gallant actions, she has provoked the war in which she is now engaged.

“By violating her treaties of extradition with Austria; by fostering deserters from her army; by rallying in Piedmont the disaffected spirits of Italy; by menacing speeches against the Austrian Government, and by ostentatious declarations that she was ready to do battle as the champion of Italy, against the power and influence of Austria, Sardinia invoked the storm, and is deeply responsible to the nations

of Europe. Her Majesty's Government saw this dangerous policy with apprehensions which have now been realized, and they cannot forbear from remarking that the first and immediate effect of the war which it has caused has been the suspension of constitutional government in Sardinia itself.

* * * *

"Deeply as Her Majesty's Government deplore that circumstances which, notwithstanding all their endeavours, they could not control, should have prevented the negotiations, begun with so much promise, from being continued, they still have the satisfaction of feeling that for a time at least they have tended to avert hostilities; and they feel sure that the Government of France, no less than that of Austria, will admit that in all these matters they have acted the part of impartial friends and allies, and that all their counsels and representations have invariably tended to inculcate in all quarters moderation and peace.

"I will not recapitulate in all their details the various efforts that Her Majesty's Government subsequently made for this object, either singly or jointly with other Powers. Her Majesty's Government found that one of the most difficult questions upon which they could obtain unanimity was that of disarmament. At first, for the sake of obtaining a Congress, they would have agreed to postpone its accomplishment until the Congress had met, but the common dictates of reason indicated that the only real security for obtaining a peaceful result from its deliberations lay in the fact of its being an assembly of unarmed States.

"It was evident that prejudices and arguments, supported by a million of soldiers, were not likely to be defended with either moderation or logic.

"Furthermore, an armed Congress would have seemed to acknowledge a case of war as between the principals who composed it; whereas, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, no case of war existed between any of them respectively.

"It was with these views that Her Majesty's Government pressed all the Powers, and finally obtained their unanimous consent to a general, simultaneous, and preliminary disarmament.

"I now pass to the formal proposal made by Her Majesty's Government on the 18th ult., which declared that measure, and the eventual admission of the Italian States as substantive members of the Congress, and I am desirous of giving full credit to the Government of France for acceding to that proposal. It will be ever a matter of regret and disappointment to Her Majesty's Government that the Cabinet of Vienna, after agreeing with all the other Powers on a general, preliminary, and simultaneous disarmament, should have been so ill advised as to reject this last opportunity of averting a war on the insufficient ground of its unwillingness to admit the participation in the Congress of the representatives of the Italian States, although it is a matter of history that such representatives were, on the common instance of Austria and other great Powers, invited to take part in the Congress of Laybach.

"Her Majesty's Government have still more deeply lamented

the precipitate conduct of Austria in calling upon Sardinia to disarm, on pain of immediate invasion of her territory in case of her refusal to obey. They lost not a moment in expressing their strong disapprobation of this proceeding; and Her Majesty's Minister at Vienna has since delivered to the Austrian Cabinet a formal protest on the part of the British Government.

"Her Majesty's Government had full reason to hope that the peace of Italy might be secured by following up in some form or other the negotiations which your Excellency had placed on apparently so sound a footing during your stay at Vienna. Whether those negotiations should be carried out by themselves alone, or in a Congress with other Powers, they trusted that the result might put an end to a state of things in Italy of which they had long disapproved, and which they agree with the Government of France in considering to be inconsistent with the spirit of European treaties.

"Animated by true friendship and frankness, Her Majesty's Government cannot refrain from expressing their opinion, that if the Government of France, which possesses so great an influence over Sardinia, had warned her as to the danger of her policy, at the time that Her Majesty's Government protested against it, those complications might have been avoided which, in virtue of their promises, have obliged the French Government to seek their solution in the entrance of a French army into Piedmont. . .

"Viewing impartially the conduct of both Austria and Sardinia in regard to Italy, and lamenting

most deeply the spirit by which both have been actuated, Her Majesty's Government can, nevertheless, have no doubt as to the course which it befits them to pursue in the present emergency.

"The British Government have always recognized as a sacred rule of international obligation, that no country has a right authoritatively to interfere in the internal affairs of a foreign State, or, with a sound policy, long withhold its acknowledgment of any new form of government which may be adopted and established, without territorial usurpation or absorption, by the spontaneous wish of its people.

"The British Government have shown, for a long series of years, how steadily they have observed these principles, *and they certainly cannot depart from them on the present occasion*, however earnest may be their desire to secure the freedom of the Italian people, and to maintain the treaties which confirmed the independence of their respective States.

"The Government of the Emperor of the French appears to anticipate that, notwithstanding the abhorrence with which Her Majesty's Government contemplate the coming war, and the value which they attach to the principle of non-interference, they will yet be brought to co-operate with France on the present occasion.

"The Imperial Government has had too many proofs, of late years, of the anxiety of the British Government to act together with them in all measures calculated to lead to the general advantage of nations, to suppose that it is otherwise than with sincere regret

that Her Majesty's Government feel themselves precluded, by every consideration, from associating themselves with France in the present struggle. They believe that that struggle will be productive of misery and ruin to Italy, and, so far from accelerating the development of freedom in that country, will impose upon it a heavier burden of present ruin and future taxation. They feel that the war, on whatever principles it may be commenced, and whatever objects it may contemplate, will infallibly become a war of extreme political passions and opinions. They cannot but dread that the events in Italy may react on other nations, and that at an early day all Europe will be involved in the conflict.

"Your Excellency, who has taken so active a part in the efforts of Her Majesty's Government to avert these results, will more easily than any one understand the bitter disappointment of Her Majesty's Government that all these efforts have proved unavailing. Nevertheless, your Excellency will assure the French Government that Her Majesty's Ministers will not be deterred by difficulties, past or future, from entertaining hereafter any overture which may be made to them by either of the contending parties, indicating a disposition to avail themselves of the good offices of England. Nay, more; Her Majesty's Government will watch with the utmost attention the various phases of the war; and if an opportunity should present itself for pleading the cause of peace and reconciliation, they will not wait to be invited, but will at once tender themselves as mediators, in the sincere hope

that their offer may be accepted and lead to peace.

"They will do so with the fixed determination to carry out such a mediation in a spirit of fairness and impartiality, and with an earnest desire to establish and secure a well-balanced and real independence of the Italian States, and a general improvement of the administration throughout the Peninsula of Italy."

The Emperor Napoleon quitted Paris on the 10th of May, and reached Genoa, by way of Marseilles, on the 12th.

Immediately on his arrival he issued the following order of the day to the army of Italy:—

"Soldiers,—I come to place myself at your head to conduct you to the combat. We are about to second the struggles of a people now vindicating its independence, and to rescue it from foreign oppression. This is a sacred cause, which has the sympathies of the civilized world. I need not stimulate your ardour. Every step will remind you of a victory. In the Via Sacra of ancient Rome inscriptions were chiselled upon the marble, reminding the people of their exalted deeds. It is the same to-day. In passing Mondovi, Marengo, Lodi, Castiglione, Arcola, and Rivoli, you will, in the midst of those glorious recollections, be marching in another Via Sacra.

"Preserve that strict discipline which is the honour of the army. Here, forget it not, there are no other enemies than those who fight against you in battle. Remain compact, and abandon not your ranks to hasten forward. Beware of too great enthusiasm, which is the only thing I fear.

"The new *armes de precision* are dangerous only at a distance. They will not prevent the bayonet from being what it has hitherto been—the terrible weapon of the French infantry.

"Soldiers, let us all do our duty, and put our confidence in God. Our country expects much from you. From one end of France to the other the following words of happy augury re-echo:—'The new army of Italy will be worthy of her elder sister.'"

Next day the Emperor was joined by King Victor Emmanuel, who came to welcome the arrival of his puissant ally; but he returned almost immediately afterwards to the head-quarters of the Sardinian army, which were at Occimiano, between Casale and Valenza; and the Emperor himself soon quitted Genoa for Alexandria, between which places there is a railway that extends to Turin.

It will be useful now to state what were the positions of the Austrian and Sardinian armies respectively at the commencement of the struggle. The main body of the Austrian army, under the command of Count Gyulai, was strongly posted in the neighbourhood of Pavia, on the left bank of the Po, at the angle which the confluence of the Ticino forms with that river, and was thus ready to act within a short distance, at whatever point on the Ticino or the Po the allied armies might choose to make their attack. It might, in fact, be said to occupy a central point in the chord of the arc along which were distributed the forces of the enemy, and thus had a much shorter distance to

march in order to oppose a concentrated attack than the allied armies, the extremities of whose lines rested upon Turin and Genoa, with Alexandria in the centre. Strong columns also advanced and took possession of Mortara and Vercelli on the 2nd of May.

On the 26th of April the position of the Sardinian army was this. Part of it formed a corps of observation along the right bank of the Po, between Voghera, Tortona, and Sala. Two brigades of infantry and a body of chasseurs were in position at Arquata, Serravalle, Gavi, and Novi, and thus defended the entrance into the valley of La Scrivia, and the approach from the east to Turin. Two brigades also of infantry, on the right bank of the Po, occupied Bassignana, Pomaro, and San Salvatore, while three brigades constituted the garrison at Alexandria.

Several changes took place in these dispositions from time to time, occasioned by the fluctuating movements of the Austrians, who seem to have acted with a strange want of decision and strategic skill. They crossed the Sesia, and threatened Ivrea, as if Turin was the object of attack, when suddenly they retraced their steps, and fell back on their former position, between the Sesia and the Ticino. General Gyulai now changed the line of his front, and faced with his right in the direction of Casale, and his left close to the point of confluence of the Ticino with the Po at Stradella. By the 6th of May the Austrians had abandoned Voghera, and recrossed the Po at Genola. They also blew up the bridge at Valenza.

The first corps of the French army, under Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, advanced towards Voghera, which it reached on the 16th of May; and its different divisions occupied Castelnuevo, Casei, and Ponte Curone. The second corps, under General M'Mahon, extended its divisions between Bassignana and Montariolo; and the fourth, under General Niel, in the rear, occupied San Salvatore, Valenza, Pomaro, and Pecello. The whole line of the Po was thus occupied by the allied army, and the Austrian general was left in complete uncertainty as to the point where the attempt would be made to cross the river. General Forey commanded the division which formed the vanguard of the French army on the extreme right; and opposite to it the Austrians, in strong force, occupied the road to Pavia, behind Casteggio. Between these troops the first serious encounter took place.

The Austrian General was anxious to ascertain the strength of the enemy on his left, in order to determine how far it was likely that the attempt to cross the Po would be made in that direction. He, therefore, on the 20th of May, ordered Count Stadion to make a *reconnaissance* with a considerable force on the right bank of the river. The troops destined for this service crossed the Po by a bridge at Vaccarizza, a few miles from Pavia and just below the junction of the Ticino and the Po. Casteggio and Montebello were occupied by Piedmontese troops, and both places were, after a short struggle, taken by the Austrians, who then pushed on in two columns, the one by

the high road and the other by the line of the railway, towards Ginestrello, when they were checked by the advance of the French troops under General Forey, who came up rapidly to the attack.

The Austrians were driven back upon Montebello, where they made a desperate stand, and a hand-to-hand combat took place in the streets of the village, the result of which was for some time doubtful. Fresh troops, however, from the French division of General Forey, continually arrived by the railway, and, to borrow the language of a contemporary account, "from the heights of Montebello the Austrians beheld a novelty in the art of war. Train after train arrived by railway from Voghera, each train disgorging its hundreds of armed men, and immediately hastening back for more. In vain Count Stadion endeavoured to crush the force in front of him before it could be increased enough to overpower him." The result was, that after an obstinate resistance the Austrians were compelled to give way, and retired upon Casteggio, which they quitted at nightfall without any molestation from the French, and crossed the Po by the bridge at Vaccarizza. This engagement was called the battle of Montebello, and the Austrians had 294 men killed and 718 wounded, losing also about 200 prisoners. The French loss amounted to 671 killed and wounded, and amongst those who fell was General Beuret, a distinguished officer who had served in Algeria and the Crimea.

The great object of the French Emperor now was to deceive the

Austrians as to the point where he meant to make the attack, and he completely succeeded. Much complaint was made of a refusal on the part of the French to receive flags of truce from the Austrian lines, but this was essential in order to conceal the manœuvre which was promptly and skilfully executed. The French Emperor wished to make the enemy believe that he intended to attack them on the right of his position, and for this purpose he concentrated troops in that direction.

The general position of the allied forces at this juncture was as follows:—Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers and General M'Mahon were in the first line on the right of the Po, occupying Voghera, Casei, Castelnuovo, Scrivia, and Sale; Marshal Canrobert was at Ponte Curone; General Niel at Bassignana and Valenza; the Imperial Guard at Alexandria. The Sardinian army in different divisions kept the Po from Monti to Frassinetto; and the Sesia at Gazzo, Motta dei Conti, Carezana, Pezzana, Prarola, and Vercelli. The division Castelborgo was in reserve, half at Casale and half at Terranova.

On the morning of the 30th of May the Piedmontese divisions at Vercelli crossed the Sesia, and moved in different directions upon Confienza, Vinzaglio, Casalino and Palestro. By this march the Austrians were led to believe that the object of attack was Mortara, where they occupied a strong position; and, to keep them still more in error, the Sardinian troops were ordered to advance upon Bobbio (between Vercelli and Mortara), which was held by the Austrians in conside-

erable force. General Gyulai, now thinking that it was the intention of Marshal Canrobert to cross the river at Prarola, determined to anticipate him by attacking Palestro with a powerful force. Palestro was occupied by Piedmontese troops commanded by the King in person, and supported by a French division under General Cialdini. A severe combat here took place which ended in the complete defeat of the Austrians; and, at the same moment, another engagement was fought at Confienza, in the district of Jomellina, in which the Piedmontese division, under General Fanti, drove back the Austrians after a sharp conflict.

In the mean time, however, the great body of the French army was marching rapidly to the left in the direction of Novara. On the 31st of May it crossed the Po at Casale and took the road to Vercelli, from which place it advanced upon Novara and encamped there, while the Austrians believed that it was threatening Mortara on their extreme left. They had recrossed the Ticino at Turbigo, and on the 2nd of June a division of the French Imperial Guard was ordered to advance towards that place, where, finding no enemy to oppose them, they threw bridges across and passed the river. They were then followed by the main body of the *corps d'armée* under General M'Mahon, and a division of the Sardinian troops, and an attack made by an Austrian corps brought up hastily by railway from Milan upon the whole body as it was forming on the Lombard side of the river was speedily repelled. In the mean time, on the same day, the division of

General Espinasse advanced on the road from Novara to Milan as far as Trecote, and the Austrians under General Count Clam, fearing for their position at Buffalora, which was threatened by the French, now abandoned their entrenchments there and retired to the left bank of the Ticino, after first attempting to blow up the stone bridge which crosses the river. But in this they were not successful, for the arches were of sufficient strength to resist the force of the explosion, and the bridge remained passable for troops. The Austrians had thus wholly abandoned the right bank of the Ticino, and their invasion of the Piedmontese territory, which had precipitated the conflict and put them in the eyes of Europe in the wrong, turned out to have been in every sense of the word a mistake; for they had not reaped one single advantage, in a military point of view, by crossing the Ticino, which now had all the appearance of a wanton and purposeless act of aggression.

The French attack was fixed for the 4th of June, when General M'Mahon's *corps d'armée*, strengthened by the division of the Voltigeurs of the Imperial Guard, and followed by the Sardinian army, was to advance from Turbigo on Buffalora and Magenta, while the division of the Grenadiers of the Imperial Guard was to carry the *tête-du-pont* of Buffalora on the left bank, and Marshal Canrobert's *corps d'armée* was to advance along the right bank to cross at the same point.

In the mean time, what was the position of the Austrian army, and how was it prepared

to meet these unexpected manœuvres? General Gyulai learned on the 3rd of June that the French had crossed the Ticino at Turbigo, and his belief was that the main attack would be made there. At this moment the different corps of his army were in position at Corbetto, Castelletto, Abbiate, Grasso, and on the Po, below Pavia, while one corps (the 8th) was on its march between Benasco and Bestazzo. When General Gyulai heard that large masses of the French were occupying Buffalora, and that General Clam had abandoned the *tête-du-pont* there, he ordered him to maintain his position at Magenta, on the left bank of the Ticino, and directed the other corps to advance with all speed to his assistance.

Owing to some of the accidents which occur in war, the French Emperor's plan of attack could not be carried out as he intended, for the Sardinian troops were delayed in crossing the river, and Marshal Canrobert's corps was, owing to the encumbered state of the road, not able to reach the Ticino until late on the day of battle. The advance also of General Espinasse's division was delayed. The Emperor himself proceeded to Buffalora to superintend the attack in person. If, however, the French were weaker than had been intended, the Austrians at Magenta were taken completely by surprise. They had no idea that, while engaged with the French at Buffalora and Magenta in front, they would be attacked by General M'Mahon's *corps d'armée*, advancing from Turbigo on their right, and their only force on that side to defend

the road leading from Turbigo was a single battalion, which occupied a large isolated farm to the right of the road behind the village of Marcello. Their line of battle extended from Buffalora through Ponte di Magenta towards Robecco, parallel to the Ticino and the Grand Canal which extends from Milan, with their reserves in the village of Magenta. General M'Mahon advanced from Turbigo on the morning of the 4th towards Buffalora and Magenta, about twelve miles distant, and at midday the Emperor ordered the attack to commence at Magenta itself. The Austrians, in the mean time, had come up there in great numbers, but wearied by a long and rapid march, and without having had time to take food, owing to the haste with which General Gyulai was obliged to endeavour to repair his blunder in allowing his right to be exposed unsupported to the full fury of the French attack. They greatly, however, outnumbered the divisions of the grenadiers of the Guard and Zouaves, which, under the Emperor in person, now rushed forward to carry the position at Magenta. They gained with an impetuous rush the high ground beside the canal, but were there stopped and surrounded by the masses of Austrians, and for four hours sustained an unequal combat with heroic bravery, in which great numbers of officers and men fell, until the attack by General M'Mahon on the Austrian right changed the fortune of the day, and converted a perilous and doubtful conflict into a brilliant victory. That General advanced in two columns

VOL. CI.

upon Buffalora and Magenta, and after a desperate action drove back the Austrians with the bayonet, fighting hand to hand amongst the trees and vineyards, which covered the ground and prevented the formation of any regular order of battle. It was only on the high road that there was any room for the use of artillery, and the combat was decided by the rifle and the bayonet. To give an idea of the deadly nature of the struggle, we will give an extract from an account of the battle by an eye-witness, which appeared in the columns of a contemporary journal:—"You never saw such a frightful scene of carnage as on all this ground, which the Austrians defended inch by inch, but had to leave at last. It is like the remains of a great rag fair; shakoes, knapsacks, muskets, shoes, cloaks, tunics, linen all stained with blood, and speaking of the obstinate resistance even now when the greater part of the wounded have been removed and the dead mostly buried. Of how many dramas of heroism and ferocity, and of how many tragedies of woes and misery, must this have been the scene! But the fiercest fight was further behind on the railway line and the station-house behind it, and the village close by. Pressed back all along the line, the Austrians concentrated here all their efforts of resistance. In front of the station beyond the line of rails is a large long pit, extending for some distance to the right and left, and formed by the excavations necessary for the construction of the line. Where the pit ceases, a line of strong wood railings,

[R]

painted yellow, is put up for some distance on both sides to prevent passing across the line. Besides this, the railway bank, which is somewhat raised, forms a kind of ready parapet, behind which the defenders enjoyed some protection. The station, as well as the neighbouring buildings and a square, solid campanile, were filled with riflemen, while the troops of the line massed themselves in front of them. As the troops came up, they were brought out here, and took the place of their exhausted comrades. To carry this strong position, the fusiliers and chasseurs of the Guard were ordered forward. They broke through, driving the enemy before them, until their course was arrested by the line of strong wooden railings. A few cannon-shot would have easily brought them down, but there was no place whence to bring them to bear, so nothing remained but to tear it down by main force and the axes of the sappers. It was done, and the column entered the village. Here every house had become a castle, held by a desperate garrison; it required a

regular combat to take it, and letter after letter could be written on the incidents in which these isolated combats abounded. There is no doubt the Austrians fought desperately, even when everything seemed lost, an incredible number of their officers being killed and wounded: the soldiers were left entirely to themselves in these isolated positions, from which there was no retreat."

In the mean time, Marshal Canrobert's division had been able to join the Emperor, and part also of the corps of General Niel, which he had sent for, had come up. General Espinasse's division was also hotly engaged, and that General himself was killed during the attack on the village of Magenta, which was taken and retaken several times in the course of the day.

Finally, at eight o'clock in the evening, the allied armies were masters of the field of battle, and the Austrians retreated, leaving four guns, and about 7000 prisoners, in the hands of the enemy.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WAR IN ITALY CONTINUED.—*The French Emperor and King of Sardinia enter Milan—Proclamation of the Emperor to the inhabitants of Lombardy—The Austrians driven out of Malegnano—Movements of Garibaldi—Retreat of the Austrians across Lombardy to the Mincio—Diplomatic Circular of the Russian Government—Advance of the Allied Armies in pursuit of the Austrians—Battle of Solferino—The Austrians retire upon the Quadrilateral—Armistice signed at Villafranca—Bases of Treaty of Peace—Proclamation of the Emperor Napoleon—Manifesto of the Emperor of Austria—Plenipotentiaries meet at Zurich—Disappointment of the Italians—Display of feeling at Florence—The French Emperor returns to Paris—Addresses to him, and his answers—Circular of the Papal Government—The Assembly of Romagna throws off its allegiance to the Pope—Reception by the King of Sardinia of deputations from Tuscany and Romagna—Letter from the Emperor Napoleon to the Pope.*

AFTER the battle of Magenta the French Emperor and the King of Sardinia entered Milan, on the 8th of June, amidst the unbounded enthusiasm of the inhabitants; and a proclamation was immediately issued, in which Victor Emmanuel, assuming that Lombardy would be annexed to his own dominions, appointed the Cavaliere Vighani governor of the territory, and made public also a great number of minute provisions for its administration.

The Emperor Napoleon also addressed from Milan the following proclamation to the inhabitants of Lombardy, on the same day:—

“Italians, — The fortune of war having brought us into the capital of Lombardy, I am about to tell you why I am here. When

Austria unjustly attacked Piedmont, I resolved to support my ally, the King of Sardinia, the honour and the interest of France making it a duty for me to do so. Your enemies, who are also mine, endeavoured to diminish the sympathy which was felt in Europe for your cause by making it believed that I only made war from personal ambition, or to aggrandize the territory of France. If there are men who do not comprehend their epoch, I am not of the number. In the enlightened state of public opinion there is more grandeur to be acquired by the moral influence which is exercised than by fruitless conquests, and that moral influence I seek, with pride, in contributing to restore to freedom one of the finest parts of Europe.

[R 2]

Your reception has already proved to me that you have understood me. I do not come here with the preconceived system of dispossessing the sovereign, nor to impose my will on you. My army will only occupy itself with two things — to combat your enemies and maintain internal order. It will not throw any obstacle in the way of the legitimate manifestation of your wishes. Providence sometimes favours nations as well as individuals, by giving them a sudden opportunity for greatness; but it is on condition that they know how to profit by it. Profit, then, by the fortune which is offered to you to obtain your independence. Organize yourselves militarily. Fly to the standard of King Victor Emmanuel, who has already so nobly shown you the path of honour. Remember that without discipline there can be no army. Be to-day only soldiers, and to-morrow you will be the free citizens of a great country."

The Austrians had evacuated Milan after the disaster at Magenta, and had assembled, in considerable force, at a place called Malegnano, halfway between Milan and Lodi, which they intended to hold, in order to protect the retreat of their main army across the Adda. But the French were equally determined to prevent this, and on the morning of the 8th of June, three divisions of the 1st corps, under Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, advanced from the neighbourhood of Milan upon the town of Malegnano, in sight of which they arrived about 5 p.m., and their march was first checked by cannon-shot fired from the bridge before the town, which the Aus-

trians had not taken the precaution to blow up. The order to advance was given, and the Zouaves rushed forward with their usual gallantry. "No resistance," says a contemporary account,* "was met until they came to a cemetery to the left of the road, just before the entrance of the town. It is surrounded by a wall from fifteen to eighteen feet high, and covered outside with tombstones of black marble embedded in it. The only entrance to it is a large, massive iron gate. This cemetery the enemy occupied in strength. Benches, from a little chapel which is enclosed by the wall, and ladders were placed against the enclosure to serve as a banquette to the defenders. In spite of these preparations the resistance on this point was not great, for already had the 10th Chasseurs, to the left, turned the position. When they arrived at the river, which, as I said before, crosses the main road, and runs to the other side of the town, they found the bridge leading over it broken. Nothing daunted by this, they jumped into the stream, and made their way through it in spite of its depth. Immediately behind the cemetery is a large farmhouse, which forms the first house of the town on this side. The walls of it had been loopholed, and the windows were occupied by riflemen. This was attacked first, and carried. What follows after it was a street fight, the 1st Zouaves, supported by the 3rd of the Line, on one side, and the 10th Chasseurs and the 15th of the Line

* Letter from a correspondent of the *Times* newspaper.

on the other. Every house was strongly occupied and obstinately defended. Concealed behind the windows, the enemy, sufficiently protected, directed a murderous fire on the attacking columns. They never showed themselves for an instant in the open, but, loading behind the walls, ran out and fired. In spite of this disadvantage, which occasioned a good deal of loss, one house after another was cleared of the Austrians."

In less than two hours the Austrians were driven entirely out of the town, with severe loss; and as they retreated, two French batteries which had come up by a bye road opened on the flank of their columns and caused considerable havoc. The French loss amounted to 50 officers and 800 men killed and wounded in the desperate contest in the streets of the town.

We must not omit to mention the gallant exertions of the well-known Italian soldier, Garibaldi, in the cause of his country at this crisis of her fate. He placed himself at the head of a band of volunteers called the Chasseurs of the Alps, and advanced on the north-west of Lombardy. At the end of May he drove the Austrians out of Como, and then crossed the Sesia, when he again repulsed the enemy opposite to Vercelli. On entering Lombardy, Garibaldi issued the following heart-stirring proclamation to the inhabitants:

"Lombards,—You are called to a new life, and you will respond to the appeal as your fathers did of yore at Ponsida and Legnano. The enemy is the same as ever—pitiless, a black assassin, and a robber. Your brethren of every province have sworn to conquer

or die with you. It is our task to avenge the insults, the outrages, and the servitude of 20 generations; it is for us to leave to our children a patrimony freed from the pollution of a foreign domination. Victor Emmanuel, chosen by the national will for our supreme chief, sends me to organize you for this patriotic fight. I deeply feel the sanctity of this mission, and I am proud to command you. To arms, then! Bondage must cease. He who can seize an arm and does not is a traitor. Italy, with her children united, and freed from foreign domination, will know how to reconquer the rank which Providence has assigned her among nations."

In the middle of June Garibaldi, wishing to throw a bridge across the Chiese, in order to keep communications with Brescia open, placed part of his troops at Rezzato and Tre Ponti to oppose the Austrian vanguard, which had advanced as far as that place. Some companies of Chasseurs d'Alpes attacked the enemy's outposts. The Austrians yielded, and were pursued as far as Castenedolo, where the main body of the enemy attempted to surround the pursuing troops, who however withdrew, and Garibaldi, coming to the rescue, succeeded in bringing the troops to their former positions, causing great loss to the enemy. The King then ordered the Fourth Division to advance to the position, and General Cialdini accordingly led part of his division to Rezzato to support Garibaldi. The Austrians withdrew from Castenedolo after having blown up the bridge over the Chiese before the town of Montechiaro.

After the loss of the battle of Magenta, the Austrian army retreated across the plains of Lombardy upon the line of the Mincio, in three main columns, the first, second, and third corps, and part of the seventh in the centre, protected by the rest of the seventh and the eighth on the right flank, and by the fifth and ninth on the left flank.

The sixth corps occupied Verona on the east or left flank of the Mincio, and the strong fortress of Mantua was held by the eleventh corps. By the 11th of June the whole army had crossed the Adda unmolested by the French and Sardinians, except near Lodi, where the Austrian General, Benedek, repelled an attack. All the bridges were blown up by the Austrians as they retreated, and the garrisons of Piacenza and Pavia abandoned both those places, having first as far as possible destroyed the defensive works, which had been constructed with great skill and at an enormous expense. The fortresses also of Lodi and Pizzighettone were rendered unserviceable, and thus the strongholds which the Austrians had with so much labour constructed to overawe Italy, and make their position, as they fancied, impregnable, were in a moment shattered by themselves, nor did they attempt to make a stand until they found themselves on the left bank of the Mincio, and within the shelter of the lines of the famous Quadrilateral, a kind of irregular square, the angles of which were occupied by the fortresses of Peschiera, Verona, Legnano, and Mantua.

A diplomatic circular was about this time addressed by the Russian

Government to its agents in Germany, which plainly intimated that, in the opinion of the cabinet of St. Petersburg, no cause existed for the intervention of the Germanic powers in the struggle, and that the desire of Russia was to "localize the war, because it arose out of local circumstances, and because it was the only means of accelerating the return of peace."

This was followed by another, addressed on the 20th of June by Count Walewski, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the diplomatic agents of France, in which he said:—

"Not only in the opinion of the Russian Government is there no occasion for Germany to interfere, because neither her interests nor her rights are in danger, but in mixing herself up in the conflict she departs from the position which treaties have assigned to her. Not only is she unable to show in the existing state of affairs the necessity of protecting the European equilibrium, which is not menaced, and which she herself compromises if she pretends to say that she is necessarily interested in a war undertaken by Austria as a European Power, and that the action of the Federal body, considered as such, ought to be exercised beyond the limits of the Confederation, but such a doctrine would be productive in effect of nothing less than the complete incorporation of the non-German provinces of Austria into the Federal Union, and in this way it would be as much opposed to the real interests of the German States as to the spirit of the European treaties which have agreed to the conditions of their existence."

After a short stay in Milan, the French Emperor and King of Sardinia put themselves in motion to follow the retreating Austrians with the allied army across the plain of Lombardy. It is not necessary to give details of this march, which, as no enemy appeared to check their advance until they reached the Mincio, was not marked by any incident of importance, and it will be sufficient to state, that on the 23rd of July the line of the French and Sardinian armies extended from the shores of the Lago di Garda at Desenzano along the western edge of the hilly country from Lonato down to Castiglione, and, bending back towards Carpenedolo, touched there the Chiese; the Emperor himself, with the Guards as a reserve, being at Montechiaro, and the King, with his staff, at Lonato. It was still uncertain what course the Austrians would adopt—whether they would contest the passage of the Mincio, or fall still further back upon their fortresses; but it was hardly anticipated that they would recross the river and assume the offensive. Such, however, proved to be the case. A reconnaissance, pushed forward by the French in the direction of the village of Solferino, met the advanced posts of the enemy; and an aeronaut, who accompanied the army, made an ascent in a balloon for the purpose of exploring their position. During the night the Austrians recrossed the Mincio in strong force, and occupied the hilly country, which in that part forms a kind of parallelogram, the four angles of which are Lonato, Peschiera, Volta, and Castiglione. Their line extended from Peschiera, on which they

leaned their extreme right, down into the plain of the Mincio, intersecting the great road to Goito. The whole line was not less than twelve miles in length. Cavriana was the centre of it, which the Emperor of Austria had chosen for his head-quarters, while Solferino was the key of the whole position.

The road to San Cassiano runs through the village of Solferino, which is of a straggling character, and on its west side rises a conical hill, on the top of which stands a square tower, which, from its commanding position, is called *le Spione d'Italia*, "the Spy of Italy." This hill stretches in a westerly direction for about 1000 yards, and then descends somewhat abruptly to the hamlet below. The road through the village is on a much lower level than the hill.

The French were not aware of the movement of the Austrians until the morning of the following day, the 24th. On the previous evening it had been arranged that a simultaneous advance of the allied forces should take place at a very early hour of the morning, on account of the excessive heat. The army of the King of Sardinia was to advance on Pozzolengo, Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers on Solferino, Marshal the Duke of Magenta on Cavriana, General Niel on Guidizzolo, and Marshal Canrobert on Medole. The Imperial Guard was to march on Castiglione, and the two divisions of cavalry of the line to take a position in the plain between Solferino and Medole.

The Austrians seem to have imagined that the whole of the allied armies had not yet crossed the Chiese, and that, therefore, by moving forward, they could at-

tack the enemy at a disadvantage. It thus happened that both the immense hosts, amounting to about four hundred thousand men, came into collision almost unexpectedly. Scarcely had Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers and General M'Mahon, who had been created Duke of Magenta, passed Castiglione, when they found themselves in presence of considerable forces, which opposed their advance. At the same instant, General Niel encountered the Austrians near Medole. The Sardinian army, which was going to Pozzolengo, also met the Austrians in advance of Rivoltella; and, on his part, Marshal Canrobert found the village of Castel Goffredo occupied by the enemy's cavalry.

We quote the following passage from the French official report of the battle:—

“All the corps of the allied army being at the time on their march at a somewhat considerable distance one from the other, the Emperor first of all directed his attention to bringing them together, so that they might mutually support each other. For that purpose, His Majesty went immediately to Marshal the Duke de Magenta, who was on the right on the plain, and who had deployed perpendicularly to the road which leads from Castiglione to Goito. As General Niel did not yet appear, His Majesty hastened the march of the cavalry of the Imperial Guard, and placed it under the orders of the Duke de Magenta, as a reserve to operate in the plain on the right of the 2nd corps. The Emperor, at the same time, sent orders to Marshal Canrobert to support General Niel as much as possible, while recommending him to guard

himself on the right against an Austrian corps which, according to information given to His Majesty, was to advance from Mantua on Azola.

“These measures having been taken, the Emperor repaired to the heights, in the centre of the line of battle, where Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, too distant from the Sardinian army to be able to act in conjunction with it, had to struggle in very difficult ground against troops which were incessantly renewed.

“The Marshal had, nevertheless, arrived at the foot of the steep hill on which the village of Solferino is built. That village was defended by considerable forces, intrenched in an old chateau and a large cemetery, both of which were surrounded by thick and crenellated walls. The Marshal had already lost a great number of men, and had had more than once to expose himself by leading on the troops of Bazaine's and Ladmiraute's divisions. Worn out with fatigue and heat, and exposed to a heavy fire of musketry, these troops gained ground with much difficulty. At this moment, the Emperor ordered Forey's division to advance, one brigade on the side of the plain, and the other on the height, against the village of Solferino, and caused it to be supported by Camou's division of light infantry of the Guard. He caused to advance with these troops the artillery of the Guard, which, under the command of General de Sevelinges and General Lebœuf, took up an uncovered position at about 300 metres from the enemy. This manœuvre decided the success in the centre. While Forey's division seized on the

cemetery, and General Bazaine dashed his troops forward into the village, the light infantry and riflemen of the Imperial Guard climbed up to the foot of the tower commanding the chateau, and possessed themselves of it. The little hills near Solferino were successively carried, and at half-past three the Austrians evacuated the position, under the fire of our artillery, placed on the crests, and left in our hands 1500 prisoners, 14 pieces of cannon, and two colours.

"While this conflict was going on, and while the fire was the heaviest, four Austrian columns, advancing between the King's army and the corps of Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, endeavoured to turn the right of the Piedmontese. Six pieces of artillery, however, ably directed by General Forgeot, had opened a very heavy fire on the flank of these columns, and forced them to retrace their steps in disorder."

The Austrian Emperor had, in the mean time, remained with his staff on a hill behind Solferino, and in front of the village of Cavriana, which the French, after taking Solferino, proceeded to attack, and as the shells fell thick and fast around him, he was compelled to retire towards Valleggio. Cavriana was then carried by the French, and thus the Austrian centre was forced, and the fortune of the day decided. But, in the mean time, a desperate struggle had been going on in the plain, at the different points of the immensely extended lines, and the horrors of the scene were increased by a tremendous thunder-storm which burst over the battle-field, darkening the air and deluging the combatants with rain. An eye-

witness, who viewed the struggle from the heights in front of the village of Cavriana, thus describes it as it appeared from that distance : *—"The small puffs of the muskets exploding were lost in the immensity of the landscape. It was only when volleys of artillery followed each other in rapid succession that the smoke took a distinct form. It was soon lost, however, in the general haze, and only broken again by the white parabola of rockets, of which the Austrians were making considerable use. The forms of the men were lost to the eye in the vast proportions of the fight, and it was only when heavy masses lay together, and they assumed an aggregate shape, that any conception could be obtained of their presence. With a telescope, one could see, as it were, myriads of men on each side fighting at all points; dead bodies of men and horses strewn on the ground, with the wreck of uniforms and arms; but to the naked eye, it seemed as if a vast anthill were in motion—men becoming pigmies, as they doubtless are, in encounters of such magnitude."

The Austrians did not—as of course they could not—deny their defeat, which, in an official account published by them, they thus sought to explain. They said, "Our right wing repulsed the Piedmontese, but, on the other hand, the order of our centre could not be restored. Losses extraordinarily heavy, a violent thunder-storm, the development of powerful masses of the enemy against our left wing, and the advance of his main body

* Correspondent of the *Times* newspaper.

against Volta, caused our retreat, which began late in the evening."

The Austrians now abandoned the line of the Mincio and fell back upon Verona, after burning the bridges which led across the river at Monzambano, Valleggio, and Goito. A strong force was, however, left in Peschiera, which lies at the point where the Mincio issues from the Lago di Garda, and which commanded the left flank of the allied army on its onward march to Verona, which is situated a short distance to the east of Peschiera. On the 1st of August the whole of the allied armies had crossed the Mincio, and Peschiera was invested by the Sardinians, while the French troops extended southwards, and a considerable *corps d'armées* was left at Goito to watch the fortress of Mantua.

But the most difficult part of the campaign was now in prospect. The Austrians occupied one of the strongest positions in the world. They were within the lines of the Quadrilateral, and, resting on these four fortresses, with their communications with the Tyrol uninterrupted in their rear, they were capable of opposing a resistance to the invader which hardly anything short of the most blundering strategy on their part could render ineffectual. The allied army, on the other hand, was at a great distance from its supplies; the losses had been enormous, and the excessive heat was producing sickness and disease in the camp. It seemed to be quite possible that the tide of victory would here be turned, and that, although it was demonstrated that the Austrian army was unable to cope successfully with the combined armies of France and Sardinia in the

open field, it might, under the shelter of its fortresses, arrest the progress of the enemy until he was compelled, by the exhaustion of the prolonged struggle, to retreat. What happened, however, took every one by surprise. In the midst of the triumphant successes of the French arms, Europe was suddenly astounded to hear that an interview had taken place between the Emperors of France and Austria at Villafranca, and that an armistice had been agreed upon. The overture which led to this came, in the first instance, from the French Emperor, and, as will be seen in the sequel, he did not hesitate to assign as one of the reasons which led him to wish for peace, the necessity which he foresaw he would be under of "accepting a combat on the Rhine" if he pushed his successes further. In other words, he felt that the chances of a collision with the whole power of the great Germanic Confederation were becoming imminent if he drove Austria to extremities, and caused the other German States to rally round her from an instinct of self-preservation.

An interview took place between the two Emperors, and the armistice was signed on the 8th of July at Villafranca by Marshal Vaillant on the part of France, and Baron Hess on the part of Austria, and was to last until the 15th of August. Two days afterwards, the Emperor Napoleon issued to his army the following order of the day, dated from Valleggio:—

"Soldiers,—An armistice has been concluded on the 8th inst. between the belligerent parties, to extend to the 15th of August next. This truce will permit you to rest after your glorious

labours, and to recover, if necessary, new strength to continue the work which you have so gloriously inaugurated by your courage and your devotion. I am about to return to Paris, and shall leave the provisional command of my army to Marshal Vaillant; but, as soon as the hour of combat shall have struck, you will see me again in your midst to partake of your dangers."

The armistice was immediately followed by the bases of a Treaty of Peace, the terms of which were arranged, and the Treaty itself was provisionally signed, on the 11th of July at Villafranca by the two Emperors. Its conditions were these:—

"The two Sovereigns will favour the creation of an Italian Confederation.

"That Confederation shall be under the honorary presidency of the Holy Father.

"The Emperor of Austria cedes to the Emperor of the French his rights over Lombardy, with the exception of the fortresses of Mantua and Peschiera, so that the frontier of the Austrian possessions shall start from the extreme range of the fortress of Peschiera, and shall extend in a direct line along the Mincio as far as Grazio; thence to Scorzarolo and Luzana to the Po, whence the actual frontiers shall continue to form the limits of Austria. The Emperor of the French will hand over (*remettra*) the ceded territory to the King of Sardinia.

"Venetia shall form part of the Italian Confederation, though remaining under the crown of the Emperor of Austria.

"The Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena return

to their States, granting a general amnesty.

"The two Emperors will ask the Holy Father to introduce indispensable reforms into his States.

"A full and complete amnesty is granted on both sides to persons compromised in the late events in the territories of the belligerent parties."

The French Emperor announced the Treaty of Villafranca to his army by a proclamation, in which he said.—

"Soldiers,—The bases of a peace have been agreed on with the Emperor of Austria; the principal object of the war is attained; Italy will for the first time become a nation. A Confederation of all the States of Italy under the honorary presidency of the Pope will reunite in one group the members of the same family. Venice, it is true, will remain under the sceptre of Austria, but it will be, nevertheless, an Italian province, forming part of the Confederation.

"The union of Lombardy to Piedmont creates for us on this side of the Alps a powerful ally, who will owe to us his independence. The governments that have taken no part in this movement, or are recalled to their territories, will comprehend the necessity of salutary reforms. A general amnesty will remove all traces of civil discord. Italy, henceforth the mistress of her own destinies, can only blame herself if she does not progress in order and liberty.

"You will soon return to France; a grateful country will receive with joy the soldiers who have carried to so high a point

the glory of our arms at Montebello, Palestro, Turbigo, Magenta, Malegnano, and Solferino; who in two months have liberated Piedmont and Lombardy, and have only stopped because the conflict was assuming a magnitude no longer in proportion to the interests that France had in this formidable war.

“Be proud, then, of your success; proud of the results obtained; proud, above all, of being the beloved sons of France, which will always be a great nation as long as she has the heart to comprehend noble causes and men like you to defend them.”

The reasons that influenced the Emperor of Austria in acceding to the Treaty of Villafranca, were publicly announced in a manifesto which on the 15th of July he addressed from Laxenburg to his people. He said,—

“When the measure of permissible concessions, that is, such as are in keeping with the dignity of the Crown and with the honour and welfare of the country, is exhausted,—when all efforts to bring about a pacific understanding have failed, there is no longer any choice, and what is indispensable becomes a duty. This duty placed me under the painful necessity of requiring from my people new and heavy sacrifices to enable me to take the field in defence of their most sacred rights.

“My faithful people responded to my summons, simultaneously rallied round the throne, and made the various sacrifices required by circumstances with a readiness which merited my grateful acknowledgment, if possible increased my heartfelt attachment to them, and inspired

me with confidence that the just cause, in defence of which my gallant army was prepared with enthusiasm to do battle, would triumph.

“Unfortunately the result was not what was generally expected. The fortune of war was not favourable to us. Austria's gallant army has again given such brilliant proofs of its oft-tried heroism and unparalleled steadiness, that it has even excited the admiration of its antagonists. I am proud to be the commander of such an army, and the country must be grateful to it for having so vigorously maintained the honour of the flag of Austria, and for having preserved it from spot or blemish.

“It is an equally indisputable fact that our adversaries, notwithstanding the greatest exertions and the employment of ample means, which had been long preparing for the intended blow, were unable—although the sacrifices made were tremendous—to obtain a decisive victory. The enemy acquired advantages, but the Austrian army, being unshaken in strength and courage, maintained a position which left the possibility open of regaining them.

“The attempt to do this would, however, have required new and not less bloody sacrifices than those which had already filled my heart with sorrow. Under such circumstances, it was my imperative duty as a monarch to take into conscientious consideration the propositions for peace which were made to me. The stake which the continuance of the war would have required would have been even greater than before, as I should have been

compelled to require from the faithful provinces of the Empire further and greater supplies of men and money than those already given. The result of renewed exertions would, besides, have been doubtful, as I was bitterly deceived in my well-founded hope that I should not stand alone in a war which was not undertaken for the rights of Austria alone.

"Notwithstanding the warm and gratefully to be acknowledged sympathy felt for our just cause in the greater part of Germany, by the Governments as well as by the people, our oldest and most natural allies obstinately refused to take cognizance of the high importance of the great question of the day. Austria was obliged alone to meet coming events, the importance of which might increase from day to day.

"The honour of Austria—thanks to the heroic exertions of her gallant army—having sustained no blemish during the war, I resolved, for political considerations, to make a sacrifice, and to sign the preliminaries which had been agreed to as a preparation for the conclusion of peace. I did this after having acquired the conviction that less unfavourable conditions were to be obtained by a direct understanding with the Emperor of the French than by means of negotiations, in which the three Great Powers not concerned in the struggle would share, and in which their collective project of mediation was likely to receive their moral support.

"Unfortunately, the separation of the greater part of Lombardy from the Empire was unavoidable. It, however, gives me heartfelt

pleasure to have restored to my beloved people the blessings of peace, which are doubly valuable, inasmuch as they will give me leisure to direct my whole and uninterrupted attention and care to the completion of a duty which I have imposed on myself. It is—firmly to establish the internal welfare and external power of Austria by a judicious development of its rich moral and material strength, as also by making such improvements in the legislation and administration as are in accordance with the spirit of the age. As my people faithfully stood by me in the moment of severe trial, so may they now, by showing confidence in me, assist in the work of peace, and in the realization of my benevolent intentions.

"My recognition of its services and my thanks I have already expressed to the army in an order of the day. I now repeat the expression of my sentiments, by thanking my people for the heroism of their sons, who went to battle for God, their Emperor, and their country. Of the comrades—and they will never be forgotten—who remained on the field of battle, I think, with sorrow."

The following Plenipotentiaries of the three Powers were afterwards nominated to conduct the negotiations and arrange the terms of the definitive Treaty of Peace at Zurich, where they met on the 6th of August. The Plenipotentiaries for France were Baron de Bourqueney and the Marquis de Banneville; for Austria, Count de Colloredo and Baron de Meysenbug; and for Sardinia, the Chevalier Desambrois.

The Treaty was not definitively

signed until the 11th of November, and its Articles were in substantial conformity with the preliminaries drawn up at Villafranca. Strictly speaking, the documents signed comprised three Treaties, by the first of which Austria ceded Lombardy to France; by the second, France ceded that province to Sardinia; and by the third, a state of peace was re-established between France, Austria, and Sardinia. It was agreed also that a Congress should be convoked to deliberate on the best means of placing the peace of Italy on a solid and durable basis.

It may be well imagined that the news of the Treaty of Villafranca fell like a thunderbolt on the hopes of the Italians. That the French Emperor, who, at the opening of the campaign, had publicly declared that Italy should be free from the Ticino to the Adriatic, should, in the full career of victory, stop short and leave the Venetian territory still subject to the power of Austria, with the mockery of being allowed to form part of an Italian Confederation under the presidency of the Pope, was a blow which they little expected; and the stipulation for the restoration of the Dukes of Tuscany and Modena to their dominions, reduced the results of the struggle to nothing more than the expulsion of the Austrians from Lombardy for a time, until they could seize the opportunity of again making themselves masters of it by issuing from the strong fortresses on the left of the Mincio, which they retained intact, as a standing menace against Italy. The feeling of disappointment and disgust was so strong at Florence,

that the French banners, which had been displayed in the streets side by side with the Sardinian, were torn down and trampled under foot. And the Provisional Government published an address to the people, in which it said,—

“Tuscans,—The news of events which dim our brightest hopes distresses the hearts of all.

“The Government participates your consternation, but we must not abandon ourselves to this feeling. We must wait till news arrives with respect to these facts, the particulars of which are not known up to the present moment. It is our duty to unite resolutely, and show by our firmness that we are worthy to be citizens of a land independent and free. As long as we display this firmness we shall not have lost all our hopes.

“Our Envoys are already on the eve of their departure for Turin, with the object of making themselves acquainted with the true position of affairs. For the moment the manifestation of grief would but be an aggravation of misfortune. Let us preserve order, which is more than ever necessary for the salvation of our country. To-morrow the Council will meet. Together with it the Government will speak in the voice of Tuscany to Victor Emmanuel, in whom all our confidence is centred.

“Tuscany will never consent to be again placed under the yoke and subjected to the influence of Austria, contrary to its own wishes and rights.”

This was signed by, amongst others, “Signor Buoncompagni, Commissioner Extraordinary of Victor Emmanuel;” and the

National Guard remained under arms all night for the purpose of preserving order and preventing an outbreak.

After the preliminaries of the Treaty had been signed at Villafranca, the Emperor Napoleon returned to Paris, and on the 19th of July he received, at the Palace of St. Cloud, the great bodies of the State, who, by the mouths of their respective presidents, vied with each other in addressing to him the language of servile flattery, of which two extracts, the one from the speech of M. Troplong, the President of the Senate, and the other from that of Count De Morny, the President of the Corps Législatif, will be a sufficient specimen. M. Troplong said:—

“When Scipio vanquished Hannibal at Zama he might have destroyed Carthage. He did not wish it, though he had bound himself to overthrow the Carthaginian power. As prudent a politician as he was an able general, he was aware that to cause too much loss to an enemy is often to incur too much loss oneself.”

And Count de Morny was still more enthusiastic. He said:—

“But the noblest victory of all is the victory you have obtained over yourself. In the burst of triumph you have shown yourself a generous enemy as well as a faithful and disinterested ally; surrounded by victorious and ardent warriors, you only thought of sparing their precious blood; you have given true liberty to Italy, delivering her from despotism, and forbidding revolutionary proceedings; finally, with that wonderful tact which characterizes you, you have gone as far

as the honour of France exacted, and not beyond her interests.”

To these addresses the Emperor replied at some length, in a speech which he intended to be his justification of a policy which he felt required defence in the eyes of France as well as of the rest of Europe. He said:—

“Gentlemen,—Finding myself again in the midst of you who, during my absence, have shown so much devotion to the Empress and to my son, I feel first of all the desire to thank you, and then to explain to you the motives of my conduct.

“When, after a successful campaign of two months, the French and Sardinian armies pitched their camp before the walls of Verona, the struggle was evidently on the point of undergoing a change in a military as well as in a political point of view. I was fatally obliged to attack in front an enemy intrenched behind great fortresses, protected against any diversion on his flanks by the neutrality of the territories which surrounded him; and in commencing the long and sterile war of sieges, I found in presence of me Europe in arms, ready either to dispute our success, or to aggravate our reverses.

“Nevertheless, the difficulty of the enterprise would neither have shaken my resolution, nor stopped the enthusiasm of my army, had not the means been out of proportion with the results to be expected. It was necessary to resolve boldly to break through the barriers raised by neutral territories, and then to accept the struggle on the Rhine as well as on the Adige. It came

to this: to accept everywhere the support of revolution. More precious blood must have been shed, and enough has been shed already; in a word, to succeed it was necessary to stake what no Sovereign ought to stake, unless the independence of his country is in danger.

"If, then, I stopped short, it was not from weariness or exhaustion, nor from abandonment of the noble cause I wished to serve, but because a louder voice spoke within my heart—'The interests of France.'

"Do you imagine it cost me nothing to put a break upon the ardour of my soldiers, who, excited by victory, wished to advance?"

"Do you suppose that it cost me nothing publicly, in the face of Europe, to curtail from my programme the territory which extends from the Mincio to the Adriatic?"

"Do you imagine that it cost me nothing to behold noble illusions destroyed in honest hearts, patriotic hopes extinguished?"

"To serve Italian independence I waged war against the grain of Europe. As soon as the destinies of my country were imperilled I concluded peace.

"And can it now be said that our efforts and sacrifices are a pure loss? No. As I said in my farewell address to my soldiers, we have a right to be proud of this short campaign. In four combats and two battles, a powerful army, inferior to none in organization and bravery, has been defeated. The King of Piedmont, once styled the Guardian of the Alps, has seen his country delivered from invasion, and the

frontier line of his States extended from the Ticino to the Mincio. The idea of Italian nationality is admitted by its warmest opponents. All the Sovereigns of the Italian peninsula understand, at last, the imperious necessity of salutary reforms.

"Thus, after having given a new proof of the military power of France, the peace which I have just concluded will be fruitful of happy results; the future will reveal them daily more and more for the happiness of Italy, the influence of France, the quiet of Europe."

And in answer to an address of congratulation from the Diplomatic Body, the Emperor said:—

"Europe was in general so unjust towards me at the commencement of the war, that I was happy to be able to conclude peace as soon as the honour and interests of France were satisfied, and to prove that it could not enter into my intentions to subvert Europe and provoke a general war. I hope that now all causes of dissent will vanish, and that peace will be of long duration."

The discontent of the Italians with their existing Governments was nowhere felt more strongly, or with better reason, than in that part of the Pope's dominions known by the name of the Romagna or the Legations. An insurrection broke out there early in the war, and Sardinian troops entered the Pontifical territory, and occupied Torre Urbano and Castelfranco, thereby encouraging the inhabitants in their resistance, and rendering attempts hopeless on the part of

the Papal Government to reduce its subjects to their allegiance. This drew forth a strong remonstrance from the Holy See, and on the 12th of July the Cardinal Secretary Antonelli (the virtual Prime Minister of the Papal Government) addressed to its representatives at foreign courts a circular, in which he said :—

“Amid all the apprehensions and anxieties occasioned by the present deplorable war, the Holy See had reason to think that it would be unmolested, after the many assurances it had received—assurances with which even the King of Piedmont had associated himself, for on the advice of the Emperor of the French, his ally, he refused the dictatorship which was offered him in the revolted provinces of the Pontifical States. But it is painful to state things have turned out very differently, and facts occur every day under the eyes of the Holy See and its Government, which show more and more how inexcusable is the conduct of the Sardinian Cabinet towards the Holy See—conduct which clearly proves that it is intended to strip the Holy See of a part of its temporal dominions.

“Since the revolt of Bologna, which his Holiness in his allocation of June 30 has already taken occasion to deplore, that city has become the rendezvous of a multitude of Piedmontese officers, coming from Tuscany and Modena for the purpose of preparing quarters for the Piedmontese troops. From these foreign States thousands of muskets have been brought, wherewith to arm insurgents and volunteers; cannons, also, have been imported to aggravate the troubles

VOL. CI.

in the revolted provinces, and to encourage the audacity of the disturbers of order.

“Another fact, which renders the refusal of the dictatorship completely illusory, and adds to a flagrant violation of neutrality an active co-operation in the maintenance of the States of the Church, is the nomination of the Marquis d’Azeglio as an extraordinary commissioner in Romagna to direct the movement of the legations during the war; this step, under the specious pretext of preventing the national movement from leading to any disorder, is a manifest usurpation of power which affects the rights of the territorial sovereign of these States.

“Events have moved on so rapidly that the Piedmontese troops have already entered the Pontifical States, occupying Torre Urbano and Castelfranco, in which places Piedmontese Bersaglieri and a part of Nervi’s Brigade have arrived. The sole object of this movement is to join the rebels in opposing an energetic resistance to the Pontifical troops, which have been sent to restore legitimate power in the rebellious provinces.

“Finally, and to complete the usurpation of the legitimate sovereignty of the Pope, two officers of engineers, one of whom is a Piedmontese, have been sent to Ferrara to mine and destroy that fortress.

“Such odious proceedings, in the perpetration of which a flagrant violation of the law of nations is manifest in more than one point of view, cannot but fill the soul of the Holy Father with bitterness and provoke in him a lively and just indignation, which

[S]

is rendered more poignant still by the surprise with which he sees such enormities proceed from the Government of a Catholic King who had accepted the advice of his august ally to refuse the dictatorship offered to him.

"All the measures taken with the view of preventing or extenuating this series of evils having been in vain, the Holy Father, not forgetful of the duties incumbent upon him for the protection of the States and for the preservation in its integrity of the temporal domain of the Holy See, which is essentially connected with the free and independent exercise of the Supreme Pontificate, protests against the violations and usurpations committed in spite of the acceptance of neutrality, and desires that his protest may be communicated to all the European Powers. Confident in the justice which distinguishes these Powers, he feels assured that they will support him; they will not permit the success of a manifest violation of the law of nations and the rights of the Holy Father. He trusts that they will not hesitate to co-operate in the vindication of those rights, and to that end he invokes their assistance and protection."

We need not give the details of the insurrectionary movement in this part of the Pope's dominions. It will be sufficient to state that on the 3rd of September the Assembly of Romagna adopted the following resolution, by which they formally cast off their allegiance to the Pope:—

"Considering that the people of Romagna, after having in former centuries lived under their own

statutes and laws, and in the beginning of the present century formed part of a civil kingdom, were in 1815 placed under the temporal government of the Pope against their will; considering that that Government, while it did not revive the old privileges, destroyed the good institutions of the Italian kingdom, and afflicted its subjects by its bad administration, well known to Europe; considering that from that moment the history of these provinces became a painful succession of revolutions and reactions, so that at length exceptional measures and the state of siege became the ordinary rule of government; considering that this produced serious evils, not only by destroying public prosperity, but also by overthrowing the moral sense of the people, with incessant danger to the tranquillity of Italy and Europe; considering that every attempt at reform was vain, that the prayers of the people remained unheard, as well as the advice of the potentates of Europe, and that the promises made were never kept; considering that the said Government has been found to be incompatible with Italian nationality, with civil equality, and political liberty; considering that it was not even able to defend the lives and property of its subjects; considering that it abdicated its sovereignty *de facto*, giving up its noblest prerogatives into the hands of Austrian generals, who for many years held the civil and military government of these provinces in their hands, and conducted it ill; considering that it cannot support itself by its own strength, but only by foreign or mercenary

armies, and has therefore become incompatible with public tranquillity and permanent order; lastly, considering that the temporal government of the Pope is substantially and historically distinct from the spiritual government of the Church, which these populations will always respect; we, representatives of the people of Romagna, convoked in general assembly, and calling God to witness as to the rectitude of our intentions, declare that the people of Romagna refuse to live any longer under the temporal sway of the Pontiff."

On the same day on which this decisive step was taken, a deputation from Tuscany arrived at Turin, to propose to Victor Emmanuel, in the name of the whole Tuscan people, the annexation of that state to Piedmont. But the king was obliged to consult the dictates of his powerful ally, the Emperor of the French, rather than his own wishes, and he therefore contented himself with returning the following cautious reply:—

"Gentlemen,—I am deeply sensible of the wish of the Tuscan Assembly. I thank you in my name and in the name of my people. We have received your wish as a solemn manifestation of the will of the Tuscan people, who, after having made the last vestige of the foreign domination in Tuscany to cease, desires to contribute to the constitution of a strong kingdom which shall defend the independence of Italy. But the Tuscan Assembly will have comprehended that the accomplishment of its wish can only take place by negotiations which are about to begin on the affairs of Italy. I will second your

desire, becoming myself strong by the rights which are given me by your wishes. I will support the cause of Tuscany before the Powers in which the Assembly places its hopes, and especially before the magnanimous Emperor of the French, who has done so much for the Italian nation. I hope that Europe will not refuse to practise towards Tuscany that work of redressing grievances which it has under less favourable circumstances practised towards Greece, Belgium, and the Danubian Principalities. Your noble country gives an admirable example of moderation and concord. You will add those virtues to that one which insures the triumph of all honest undertakings and which overcomes all obstacles—namely, perseverance."

The deputation from the Romagna was received by the King of Sardinia on the 24th of September, and he returned the following answer to their offer to incorporate the Legations as part of the Piedmontese territory. It will be easily understood that the cautious nature of this reply also was dictated by the fear of offending the French Emperor, if the King unambiguously accepted what they so earnestly desired. He said:—

"I am grateful for the wishes of the people of the Romagna, of which you are the interpreter before me.

"As a Catholic Sovereign, I shall myself always retain a profound and unalterable respect for the superior Hierarchy of the Church.

"As an Italian Prince I am reminded that Europe—having in view the state of the Romag-

[S 2]

nese people, who demanded prompt and efficient measures of reform—has accepted formal obligations towards your country.

“I receive your wishes, and, strong by the rights conferred upon me, I will support your cause before the Great Powers. You may rely on their sense of justice. You may rely upon the generous love of our country of the French Emperor, who will accomplish the great work of reparation he has so powerfully begun, and who, assured of the gratitude of Italy, and seeing the moderation which has characterized your resolution during the late moments of incertitude, will recognize that in the Romagna the mere hope of a national government suffices to put an end to civil disorders.

“When your numerous volunteers arrived during the days of the national struggle, to enrol themselves under my flag, you knew that Piedmont would not go to war for herself alone, but for our common country.

“To-day the unanimity of your wishes, and the order which you observe at home, is very gratifying to my heart, and nothing better could insure your future destiny.

“Europe will recognize that it is her common duty, and also to her common interest, to finish the era of disorder, and thereby satisfy the legitimate desires of the people.”

This reception, and the answer to the revolted provinces, gave the deepest offence to the Papal Government, and, in consequence, the Pope sent to the Comte de la Minerva, the Sardinian *chargé d'affaires* at Rome, his passports,

and directed him to quit the city.

The different Assemblies of the Central Italian States afterwards agreed to offer the Regency of those States to Prince de Carignan, a cousin of King Victor Emmanuel, but the pressure of French influence compelled him to decline it; and upon his recommendation the Chevalier Buoncompagni, who had, as we have seen, been acting as Extraordinary Commissioner of the King of Sardinia in Tuscany, was nominated and accepted as Regent.

We close our narrative of the events of the year with a remarkable letter, addressed on the last day of December by the Emperor Napoleon to the Pope, in answer to one sent from the Vatican; and he plainly intimated that the Holy See must be prepared to surrender the Legations, or, at all events, that it could not look to any aid from France to recover its lost authority there. He said:—

“Most Holy Father,—The letter which your Holiness deigned to write me on the 2nd of December touched me deeply, and I will reply with entire frankness to the appeal made to my good faith.

“One of my most serious anxieties during, as well as after, the war, was the condition of the States of the Church, and, assuredly, among the potent reasons which induced me to conclude peace so promptly, you must reckon the fear of seeing the revolution assume daily increasing dimensions. Facts have an inexorable logic, and, despite my devotion to the Holy See, despite the presence of my troops at Rome, I could not avoid a cer-

tain amount of connection with the results of the national movement caused in Italy by the struggle against Austria.

"As soon as peace was concluded I hastened to write to your Holiness to submit to you the views which I considered best suited to lead to the pacification of the Romagna, and I still entertain the opinion, that if your Holiness had from that time consented to an administrative separation of those provinces, and to the nomination of a lay governor, they would have returned to your rule. Unhappily, this was not the case, and I found myself powerless to prevent the establishment of the new Government. My endeavours only succeeded in preventing a spread of the insurrection, and the resignation of Garibaldi preserved the Marches of Ancona from certain invasion.

"Now the Congress is about to assemble, the Powers cannot disown the incontestable rights of the Holy See to the Legations; nevertheless, it is probable that they will not be of opinion that you should have recourse to force to subject them. For, if that subjection were obtained by the aid of foreign troops, it would imply the military occupation of the Legations for a long time. This occupation would keep alive the hatreds and resentments of a great portion of the Italian people, as also the jealousy of the great Powers; this would be, then, to perpetuate a state of irritation, distrust, and fear.

"What remains, then, to be done? for this state of uncertainty cannot last for ever. After a serious consideration of the difficulties and dangers which the different combinations present—I say it with sincere regret, and

painful as the conclusion may be—that the solution which appears to me most conformable to the true interests of the Holy See will be to surrender the revolted provinces. If the Holy Father, for the sake of the peace of Europe, should give up these provinces, which for fifty years have been a great embarrassment to his Government, and if, in exchange, he should request the great Powers to guarantee to him the possession of the remainder, I do not doubt of the immediate restoration of tranquillity. Then the Holy Father would insure to grateful Italy peace for many years, and to the Holy See the peaceful possession of the States of the Church.

"I am sure your Holiness will not misconstrue the sentiments which animate me. You will understand the difficulty of my position; you will give a kind interpretation to my frank language, remembering all that I have already done for the Catholic religion and for its august Head.

"I have expressed, without reserve, my full mind, and I thought it indispensable to do so before the Congress. But I beg of your Holiness, whatever decision you may come to, to believe that it will in no respect change the line of conduct which I have always observed in respect of you.

"Thanking your Holiness for the Apostolic blessing which you have sent to the Empress, to the Prince Imperial, and to myself, I renew to you the assurance of my profound veneration.

"I am, of your Holiness, your devoted son,

"NAPOLEON.

"Palace of the Tuileries,
"Dec. 31, 1859."

CHAPTER X.

CHINA.—Hon. Mr. Bruce appointed Minister Plenipotentiary in China—His Instructions—Arrival at Hong Kong—Evasive delays of the Chinese—The English and French Ambassadors proceed to the Peiho river—Attempt to enter the river—The forts open fire—Disastrous failure on our part—Chinese account of the action—The British squadron returns to Shanghai.

JAPAN.—Articles of the Treaty between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan.

UNITED STATES.—Message of the President.

TOPICS.—Slavery—African Slave Trade—China—Foreign Relations—Island of San Juan—Mexico—Refusal of Supplies—Finance.

CHINA.—By the Treaty of Tien-tsin, recorded in our last volume, provision was made for the appointment of Ambassadors or Ministers on the part of Great Britain and China respectively at the Courts of St. James's and Peking, and also for the permanent establishment of a British Minister and his suite at Peking. The Hon. Mr. Bruce (brother of the Earl of Elgin, to whom the Treaty of Tien-tsin was due) was accordingly appointed Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in China, and in a letter addressed to him by Lord Malmesbury, the Foreign Secretary, and dated March 1, 1859, he received the following instructions as to the conduct he was to pursue on his arrival in the Chinese waters:—First, he was to supersede Sir John Bowring as Governor of Hong Kong, and transfer the general direction of British affairs in China from

Hong Kong to Shanghai. In deference to the advice given by Lord Elgin on the subject, and the conclusion at which the French Government had also arrived, Mr. Bruce was to fix, "for the present, at least," the residence of the British Mission at Shanghai, and only to require that it should be received occasionally at Peking. The instructions then proceeded:—

"Her Majesty's Government are prepared to expect that all the arts at which the Chinese are such adepts will be put in practice to dissuade you from repairing to the capital, even for the purpose of exchanging the ratifications of the Treaty; but it will be your duty firmly, but temperately, to resist any propositions to that effect, and to admit of no excuses; and you will say that the effect of any persistence on the part of the Chinese Government in throwing obstacles in

the way of your arrival at Pekin, and of the presentation of your credentials to the Emperor in person, will be that Her Majesty's Government will insist on the literal fulfilment of the Treaty, and establish the Mission permanently at Pekin.

"You will probably find it advisable, before your departure from Shanghai, to send an intimation to Pekin of your approach, and to request that suitable arrangements may be made for your honourable reception at the mouth of the Peiho and at Tientsin, and for your journey from that place to Pekin. The Admiral in command of Her Majesty's naval forces in China has been directed to send up with you to the mouth of the Peiho a sufficient naval force; and, unless any unforeseen circumstances should appear to make another arrangement more advisable, it would seem desirable that you should reach Tientsin in a British ship of war."

Then followed instructions as to the course to be adopted at Pekin, which it is unnecessary to detail, as, unfortunately, our Ambassador did not arrive there. He reached Hong Kong in the month of May, and was joined afterwards by M. de Bourboulon, the Ambassador and Plenipotentiary of France. They then proceeded to Shanghai, where a proposal was made to them on the part of the Chinese Government, that the ratifications of the Treaty should be exchanged at that spot, instead of at Pekin; or that the Ambassadors should be, at all events, conducted from Shanghai to Pekin by land, a journey of two months, instead of going up the river Peiho to

the capital. They, however, determined on proceeding by the Peiho, and after tedious delays, caused by evasive pretexts put forward by the Chinese authorities, the two Plenipotentiaries arrived off the island of Sha-lin-tien, in the Gulf of Pechili, on the 17th of June, escorted by a squadron of gunboats and a few other vessels, the whole being under the command of Rear-Admiral Hope, Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's ships on the China station. On the 18th, Admiral Hope proceeded in advance to the mouth of the Peiho river, in order to make known to the local authorities the intended arrival of the Plenipotentiaries, and also to reconnoitre the state of the defences at the entrance of the river. "These last," Admiral Hope says in his despatch, "appeared to consist principally of the reconstruction, in earth, and in an improved form, of the works destroyed last year, strengthened by additional ditches and abattis, as well as an increased number of booms of a very much more formidable nature. Very few guns were seen, but a considerable number of embrasures were masked with matting, evidently with a view of concealing others."

An officer was sent to the shore to communicate with the authorities, but he was prevented from landing, and the Chinese assured him that there were no officials nearer than Tientsin, and a promise was given that the obstructions at the mouth of the river should be removed, in order to enable the Plenipotentiaries to proceed to Tientsin. On the following day, the whole of the squadron was moved up

to the anchorage off the mouth of the Peiho, and the gunboats were placed inside the bar. The obstructions still remained, and an evasive answer was returned to a letter addressed to the authorities at Tien-tsin. Thus matters stood until the 21st, when the Plenipotentiaries desired the Admiral to take the matter into his own hands, and adopt such measures as he might deem expedient for clearing away the obstructions in the river. Notice of the intention of the Admiral to force a passage if the obstructions were not removed was then sent to Tien-tsin, and as this produced no reply, Admiral Hope took his vessels, on the 24th, inside the bar, and made immediate preparations for forcing a passage up the river. In the course of the next night some of the cables attached to the boom across the channel were burst by our men, but on the following day they were found reunited by the Chinese. The gunboats were now placed in position, the *Opossum*, under Captain Willes, being in advance, close to the stakes, and the Admiral hoisted his flag on board the *Plover*, which formed, with several other gunboats, a line parallel to the works of the South Fort. The *Nimrod* was placed in rear of this line, so as to command with her fire the North Fort. At 2 P.M. the *Opossum* was ordered to force a passage through the first barrier, which she succeeded in doing; but as she advanced to the second barrier, behind the first, followed by the *Plover* and two other gunboats, a tremendous fire suddenly opened from the forts from guns of large calibre, which had been concealed in embrasures hidden

by matting, and the weight and precision of the fire were such that the gunboats inside the first barrier were obliged to retire outside of it, and take up fresh positions, from which they kept up the action against the forts. Admiral Hope, who was himself severely wounded, says in his despatch:—

“In consequence of the *Plover's* disabled state, I shifted my flag to the *Cormorant*; and at 4.20 a severe wound I had received about an hour previously compelled me to call Capt. Shadwell on board the *Cormorant*, and intrust to him the more immediate command of the squadron.

“At 5.40 the *Kestrel* sank in her position; and it became necessary to put the *Lee* on the ground to avoid the like result.

“At 6.30 the fire from the North Forts ceased altogether, and half an hour later that on the south side was silenced, with the exception of that proceeding from one gun in the outer or south bastion, one in the curtain on each side of it, and one in the flank of the centre bastion, also one in the detached fort to the south.”

So far no great harm had been done by the Chinese, and if our attempt to force the passage had ended for the time here, it would have been nothing more than a slight and temporary check occasioned by physical obstacles in conjunction with base treachery on the part of our assailants. But unfortunately our contempt for our cowardly enemy was carried too far, and the Admiral thought that the forts might be taken by a *coup de main* if a body of men were landed from the vessels. Accordingly orders were given to man the

boats and effect a landing, and the force destined for that purpose consisted of a detachment of Sappers and Miners, a brigade of Marines, and a division of British and French seamen.

Our own men were commanded by Captain Shadwell, and the French detachment (which did not exceed 60 men) by Captain Tricault. A landing was effected soon after 7 P.M. opposite the outer bastion of the South Fort, and the following account of the disasters that ensued, written by an eye-witness, is so graphic that we prefer to quote it rather than attempt a description of our own:—

“Just as the first boat touched the shore, bang went a gun again from the forts, immediately followed by a perfect hurricane of shot, shell, gingsal balls, and rockets, from all the southern batteries, which mowed down our men by tens as they landed. Nevertheless, out of the boats they all leaped with undiminished ardour (many into water so deep that they had to swim to the shore), and dashed forward through the mud, while the ships threw in as heavy a covering fire as they possibly could.

“The enemy’s fire, however, continued to be so deadly, and the mud proved so deep (in most places reaching up to the men’s knees, at least—often up to their waists) that out of the 1000 men who landed, barely 100 reached the first of the three deep and wide ditches, which, after some 500 yards of wading through the mud, presented themselves before the gallant few who got so far, and out of that small number scarcely 20 had been able to keep their rifles or their ammunition dry. Nevertheless, they boldly faced

these new difficulties, and some 50 of them, with a crowd of officers (among whom were conspicuous the commanding officer of the French contingent, Commanders Commerell and Heath, R.N., Major Parke, and Lieutenant Hawkey, of the Marines, Major Fisher and Lieutenant Maitland, of the Engineers), succeeded in getting as far as the furthest bank of the third ditch, from which they would certainly have made a good attempt to scale the walls had ladders been forthcoming; but, out of the number that were landed, all but one had either been broken by shot or had stuck in the mud. With the remaining one, however, ten devoted men sprang forward, three of whom were immediately shot dead, and five wounded severely.

“A vertical fire of arrows, as well as a constant fusillade, was kept up on the select band, who now crouched in the ditch, waiting, but in vain, for reinforcements; and that any of them afterwards escaped alive is miraculous. Seeing what insurmountable difficulties presented themselves, the order was at last given to retire; the lion-hearted commander of the troops, Colonel Lemon, of the Royal Marines (who was one of the first into the furthest ditch), Captain Vansittart, of the *Magicienne*, and Captain Shadwell, of the *Highflyer*, all having been severely wounded. The latter was badly shot through the foot shortly after landing, but nevertheless managed to struggle manfully forward, even to the advanced trench. Poor Captain Vansittart had his leg shot off. Lieutenant Graves, of the *Assistance*; Lieutenant Clut-

terbuck, of the *Coromandel*; young Herbert, of the *Chesapeake*; and Lieutenants Inglis and Woolridge, of the Royal Marines, were all killed while gallantly cheering on their men; and at least three-fourths of the officers who landed were more or less severely hit. In effecting the retreat even more lives were lost, perhaps, than in advancing, as the Chinese, by lighting blue lights, were enabled to discover the exact position of our then reeling and thoroughly exhausted men, and so to shoot them down like birds. Even on arriving at the water's edge matters were not improved, as so many of the boats had been smashed to pieces by round shot that there were not enough remaining to take off the surviving men. Several were drowned in attempting to get off, while many had to remain for more than an hour up to their necks in water before they could get a place in a boat; and even then their dangers were not past, as the fire from the forts continued so heavy that several boats full of wounded were struck and swamped while pulling off to the ships. The *Coromandel* was made the temporary hospital ship, and the scene on her upper deck was truly horrible."

In this unfortunate attempt on shore sixty-four officers and men were killed, and 252 wounded, besides twenty-five who were killed and ninety-three who were wounded on board the gunboats during the action. Two of the gunboats, the *Plover* and *Lee*, went aground, and could not be got off, so that they fell into the hands of the enemy; and another, the *Cormorant*, was so damaged by the fire from the forts that

she sank at her anchors. Our losses were, in fact, out of all proportion to the numbers engaged, and we sustained a mortifying repulse from a people with whom our only chance of ultimate success is the conviction forced upon their minds that we are invincible. Such a defeat is likely to do away with the effect of previous victories, and to involve us in another war with the barbarian empire of China. It may be worth while to quote a Chinese official account of the affair, written by a functionary who styled himself "Sung-ko-lin-sin, Imperial Commissioner, Prince of Potosakutai of the Korchin tribe." He said, speaking of himself in the third person:—

"He cannot bear to speak minutely of the insolent bearing of the rebellious barbarians during several days; suffice it to say, that when your slave Hang-fuh had hastened to Peitang, and written to their envoy upon the subject of proceeding to a personal conference, they paid no attention to him, but reiterated their demands for the complete removal of all obstructions within a specified time.

"On the night of the 24th inst. they came in one of their small boats within the iron stakes, and burst asunder with shell two of the large iron chains which crossed the river, and one large cocoa-fibre cable, when they fell in with our guard boat and retired. Not a shot was fired at them from guns or small arms by our men, who at once proceeded to reconnect firmly the iron cables, and stretched them, as before, athwart the stream, so as to bar the passage up.

"Early on the morning of the 25th, upwards of ten barbarian steamers having taken up their position outside the iron stakes, and just below the fort, on the southern bank, three of them came close up to the stakes, the foremost prongs of which were, by the agency of several swimmers, bound round with ropes, and the ends of these made fast to the sterns of the vessels. Another steamer then wheeled round and dragged them up, and, after an interval of more than six hours, upwards of ten of the stakes were pulled away, while the vessels in position all hoisted red flags [thus showing] a determination to commence hostilities.

"To put up with this proud, rebellious bearing was indeed difficult; but the reflection that the measure of pacification, which was now in the second year of process, would be utterly deranged were a fire once opened, induced [the memorialist] to submit to it in silence, and quietly to abide his time, thus encouraging the barbarians in their pride, and feeding the fury of our soldiers. Just as the action was about to commence, an officer with a communication from the Tautai of Tien-tsing was sent once more to warn them. The barbarians would not permit the letter to be handed in, and their vessels advancing, like a swarm of bees, right up to the second fort upon the southern bank, bore straight down upon the iron chains twice; but, being all brought up by these, they opened fire upon our batteries. Our soldiers, pent in as their fury had been for a long time,

could no longer be restrained; the guns of every division, large and small, opened upon all sides, and at evening the firing had not ceased.

"More than twenty boats now came alongside the bank of the Southern Fort, and the barbarians, having landed in a body, formed outside the trench; our gíngal and matchlock divisions were then brought up to oppose them, and fired several volleys. The barbarians did not venture to cross the ditch, but threw themselves down among the rushes, and fired on us from their ambush. Such murderous ferocity was, indeed, calculated to make one's hair stand up (*i. e.* with rage); and to vindicate the honour of the State, and fulfil at the same time the expectations of the Government, your slaves were obliged to bring forward their troops to oppose them with their utmost strength. Your slave, Hang-fuh, who had been stationed on the New River, put himself at the head of his cavalry and infantry as soon as he heard the cannonade, and returned to Taku, bringing up his men as a reserve by a road from the rear. At the same time Wan Yu, the Commissioner of Finance, arrived also from Panting.

"Your slave has now reverently embodied in this memorial a circumstantial account of this fierce encounter of our infuriated troops with the rebellious barbarian, who disobeyed our reasonable injunctions, forwarding it at the rate of 60 li (per day). Prostrate, he entreats thereon your Majesty's sacred glance and instructions."

After the action the British

squadron returned to Shanghai, there to await orders and reinforcements from home.*

JAPAN.—We mentioned in our preceding volume that we were then unable to lay before our readers an authentic account of the articles of the Treaty concluded in 1858 between Her Majesty and the Tycoon (or Emperor) of Japan. The ratifications were formally exchanged at Yedo on the 11th of July this year, and the following are the principal articles of the Treaty:—

Art. I. There shall be perpetual peace and friendship between Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, her heirs and successors, and his Majesty the Tycoon of Japan, and between their respective dominions and subjects.

Art. II. Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland may appoint a Diplomatic Agent to reside at the city of Yedo, and Consuls or Consular Agents to reside at any or all the ports of Japan, which are opened for British commerce by this Treaty. His Majesty the Tycoon of Japan may appoint a Diplomatic Agent to reside in London, and Consuls, or Consular Agents, at any or all the ports of Great Britain.

Art. III. provides for the opening of certain ports and towns to British subjects at various dates.

* It is right to mention the friendly conduct of an American steamer (on board which was Mr. Ward, the American minister) during the conflict. It towed up several of our boats, carried away men from the disabled vessels out of the fire, and rendered every assistance to the wounded, sending presents of fresh meat and vegetables.

Art. IV. All questions in regard to rights, whether of property or person, arising between British subjects in the dominions of his Majesty the Tycoon of Japan, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the British authorities.

Art. V. Japanese subjects, who may be guilty of any criminal act towards British subjects, shall be arrested and punished by the Japanese authorities according to the laws of Japan.

British subjects who may commit any crime against Japanese subjects, or the subjects or citizens of any other country, shall be tried and punished by the Consul, or other public functionary authorized thereto, according to the laws of Great Britain. Justice shall be equitably and impartially administered on both sides.

Art. IX. British subjects in Japan shall be allowed the free exercise of their religion, and for this purpose shall have the right to erect suitable places of worship.

Art. XII. If any British vessel be at any time wrecked or stranded on the coasts of Japan, or be compelled to take refuge in any port within the dominions of the Tycoon of Japan, the Japanese authorities, on being apprised of the fact, shall immediately render all the assistance in their power; the persons on board shall receive friendly treatment, and be furnished, if necessary, with the means of conveyance to the nearest consular station.

Art. XIII. Any British merchant vessel arriving off one of the open ports of Japan, shall be

at liberty to hire a pilot to take her into port. In like manner, after she has discharged all legal dues and duties, and is ready to take her departure, she shall be allowed to hire a pilot to conduct her out of port.

Art. XIV. At each of the ports open to trade, British subjects shall be at full liberty to import from their own or any other ports, and sell there, and purchase therein, and export to their own or any other ports, all manner of merchandize, not contraband, paying the duties thereon, as laid down in the tariff annexed to the present Treaty, and no other charges whatsoever. With the exception of munitions of war, which shall only be sold to the Japanese Government and foreigners, they may freely buy from Japanese, and sell to them, any articles that either may have for sale, without the intervention of any Japanese officers in such purchase or sale, or in making or receiving payment for the same; and all classes of Japanese may purchase, sell, keep, or use any articles sold to them by British subjects.

Art. XXIII. It is hereby expressly stipulated that the British Government and its subjects will be allowed free and equal participation in all privileges, immunities, and advantages, that may have been, or may be hereafter, granted by his Majesty the Tycoon of Japan to the Government or subjects of any other nation.

The Treaty was accompanied by a number of written regulations as to the mode in which British trade is to be conducted in Japan.

UNITED STATES. — The Message of the President (Mr.

Buchanan) was communicated to Congress on the 27th of December. The following are the passages of most general interest.

"SLAVERY.—Our Union is a stake of such inestimable value as to demand our constant and watchful vigilance for its preservation. In this view let me implore my countrymen, North and South, to cultivate the ancient feelings of mutual forbearance and good-will towards each other, and strive to allay the demon spirit of sectional hatred and strife now alive in the land. This advice proceeds from the heart of an old public functionary whose service commenced in the last generation, among the wise and Conservative statesmen of that day, now nearly all passed away, and whose first and dearest earthly wish is to leave his country tranquil, prosperous, united, and powerful.

"We ought to reflect that in this age, and especially in this country, there is an incessant flux and reflux of public opinion. Questions, which in their day assumed a most threatening aspect, have now nearly gone from the memory of men. They are volcanoes burnt out, and on the lava, and ashes, and squalid scoræ of old eruptions grow the peaceful olive, the cheering vine, and the sustaining corn. Such, in my opinion, will prove to be the fate of the present sectional excitement, should those who wisely seek to apply the remedy continue always to confine their efforts within the pale of the Constitution.

"Self-preservation is the first instinct of nature, and, therefore, any state of society in which the sword is all the time sus-

pended over the heads of the people must at last become intolerable. But I indulge in no such gloomy forebodings. On the contrary, I firmly believe that the events at Harper's Ferry, by causing the people to pause and reflect upon the possible peril of their cherished institutions, will be the means, under Providence, of allaying the existing excitement, and preventing future outbreaks of a similar character. They will resolve that the Constitution and the Union shall not be endangered by rash counsels, knowing that should 'the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken . . . at the fountain,' human power could never reunite the scattered and hostile fragments.

"I cordially congratulate you upon the final settlement, by the Supreme Court of the United States, of the question of slavery in the territories, which had presented an aspect so truly formidable at the commencement of my administration. The right has been established of every citizen to take his property of any kind, including slaves, into the common territories belonging equally to all the States of the confederacy, and to have it protected there under the Federal Constitution. Neither Congress nor a territorial legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair this vested right. The supreme judicial tribunal of the country, which is a co-ordinate branch of the Government, has sanctioned and affirmed these principles of constitutional law, so manifestly just in themselves, and so well calculated to promote peace and harmony among the States.

"It is a striking proof of the sense of justice which is inherent in our people, that the property in slaves has never been disturbed, to my knowledge, in any of the territories. Even throughout the late troubles in Kansas there has not been any attempt, as I am credibly informed, to interfere, in a single instance, with the right of the master. Had any such attempt been made, the judiciary would, doubtless, have afforded an adequate remedy. Should they fail to do this hereafter, it will then be time enough to strengthen their hands by further legislation. Had it been decided that either Congress or the Territorial Legislature possess the power to annul or impair the right to property in slaves, the evil would be intolerable.

"AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.—All lawful means at my command have been employed, and shall continue to be employed, to execute the laws against the African slave-trade. After a most careful and rigorous examination of our coasts, and a thorough investigation of the subject, we have not been able to discover that any slaves have been imported into the United States except the cargo by the *Wanderer*, numbering between 300 and 400. Those engaged in this unlawful enterprise have been rigorously prosecuted, but not with as much success as their crimes have deserved. A number of them are still under prosecution.

"Our history proves that the fathers of the Republic, in advance of all other nations, condemned the African slave-trade. It was, notwithstanding, deemed expedient by the framers of the

Constitution to deprive Congress of the power to prohibit 'the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit prior to the year 1808.'

"It will be seen that this restriction on the power of Congress was confined to such States only as might think proper to admit the importation of slaves. It did not extend to other States, or to the trade carried on abroad. Accordingly, we find that as early as the 22nd of March, 1794, Congress passed an act imposing severe penalties and punishments upon citizens and residents of the United States who should engage in this trade between foreign nations. The provisions of this act were extended and enforced by the Act of the 10th of May, 1800.

"For a period of more than half a century there has been no perceptible addition to the number of our domestic slaves. During this period their advancement in civilization has far surpassed that of any other portion of the African race. The light and the blessings of Christianity have been extended to them, and both their moral and physical condition has been greatly improved.

"Re-open the trade, and it would be difficult to determine whether the effect would be more deleterious on the interests of the master or on those of the native-born slave. Of the evils of the master, the one most to be dreaded would be the introduction of wild, heathen, and ignorant barbarians among the sober, orderly, and quiet slaves, whose ancestors have been on the soil for several generations.

This might tend to barbarize, demoralize, and exasperate the whole mass, and produce most deplorable consequences.

"The effect upon the existing slave would, if possible, be still more deplorable. At present he is treated with kindness and humanity. He is well fed, well clothed, and not over-worked. His condition is incomparably better than that of the coolies which modern nations of high civilization have employed as a substitute for African slaves. Both the philanthropy and the self-interest of the master have combined to produce this humane result. But let this trade be re-opened, and what will be the effect?—the same, to a considerable extent, as on a neighbouring island, the only spot now on earth where the African slave-trade is openly tolerated; and this in defiance of solemn treaties with a Power abundantly able, at any moment, to enforce their execution.

"There the master, intent upon present gain, extorts from the slave as much labour as his physical powers are capable of enduring, knowing that, when death comes to his relief, his place can be supplied at a price reduced to the lowest point by the competition of rival African slave-traders. Should this ever be the case in our country—which I do not deem possible—the present useful character of the domestic institution, wherein those too old and too young to work are provided for with care and humanity, and those capable of labour are not overtasked, would undergo an unfortunate change. The feeling of reciprocal dependence and attachment which now exists

between master and slave, would be converted into mutual distrust and hostility.

"But we are obliged, as a Christian and moral nation, to consider what would be the effect upon unhappy Africa itself if we should re-open the slave-trade. This would give the trade an impulse and extension which it has never had even in its palmyest days. The numerous victims required to supply it, would convert the whole slave coast into a perfect pandemonium, for which this country would be held responsible in the eyes both of God and man. Its petty tribes would then be constantly engaged in predatory wars against each other for the purpose of seizing slaves to supply the American market. All hopes of African civilization would thus be ended.

"On the other hand, when a market for African slaves shall no longer be furnished in Cuba, and thus all the world be closed against this trade, we may then indulge a reasonable hope for the gradual improvement of Africa. The chief motive of war among the tribes will cease whenever there is no longer any demand for slaves. The resources of that fertile but miserable country might then be developed by the hand of industry, and afford subjects for legitimate foreign and domestic commerce. In this manner Christianity and civilization may gradually penetrate the existing gloom.

"CHINA.—The wisdom of the course pursued by this Government towards China has been vindicated by the event. While we sustained a neutral position in the war waged by Great Bri-

tain and France against the Chinese empire, our late Minister, in obedience to his instructions, judiciously co-operated with the Ministers of these Powers in all peaceful measures to secure by treaty the just concessions demanded by the interests of foreign commerce. The result is, that satisfactory treaties have been concluded with China by the respective Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia. Our 'treaty, or general convention of peace, amity, and commerce,' with that empire was concluded at Tientsin on the 18th of June, 1858, and was ratified by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the 21st of December following.

"On the 15th of December, 1858, John E. Ward, a distinguished citizen of Georgia, was duly commissioned as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to China. He left the United States for the place of his destination on the 5th of February, 1859, bearing with him the ratified copy of this treaty, and arrived at Shanghai on the 28th of May. From thence he proceeded to Peking on the 16th of June, but did not arrive in that city until the 27th of July. According to the terms of the treaty the ratifications were to be exchanged on or before the 18th of June, 1859. This was rendered impossible by reasons and events beyond his control, not necessary to detail; but still it is due to the Chinese authorities at Shanghai to state that they always assured him no advantage should be taken of the delay, and this pledge has been faithfully re-deemed.

"On the arrival of Mr. Ward at Peking, he requested an audience of the Emperor to present his letter of credence. This he did not obtain, in consequence of his very proper refusal to submit to the humiliating ceremonies required by the etiquette of this strange people in approaching their sovereign. Nevertheless, the interviews on this question were conducted in the most friendly spirit and with all due regard to his personal feelings and the honour of his country. When a presentation to his Majesty was found to be impossible, the letter of credence from the President was received with peculiar honours by Kweiliang, 'the Emperor's Prime Minister, and the second man in the empire to the Emperor himself.' The ratifications of the treaty were afterwards, on the 16th of August, exchanged in proper form at Pei-tsang. As the exchange did not take place until after the day prescribed by the treaty, it is deemed proper, before its publication, again to submit it to the Senate.

"It is but simple justice to the Chinese authorities to observe, that throughout the whole transaction they appear to have acted in good faith and in a friendly spirit towards the United States. It is true this has been done after their own peculiar fashion; but we ought to regard with a lenient eye the ancient customs of an empire dating back for thousands of years, so far as this may be consistent with our own national honour. The conduct of our Minister on the occasion has received my entire approbation.

"In order to carry out the
VOL. CI.

spirit of this treaty, and to give it full effect, it became necessary to conclude two supplemental conventions—the one for the adjustment and satisfaction of the claims of our citizens, and the other to fix the tariff on imports and exports, and to regulate the transit duties and trade of our merchants with China. This duty was satisfactorily performed by our late Minister. These conventions bear date at Shanghai on the 8th of November, 1858. Having been considered in the light of binding agreements subsidiary to the principal treaty, and to be carried into execution without delay, they do not provide for any formal ratification or exchange of ratifications by the contracting parties.

"This was not deemed necessary by the Chinese, who are already proceeding in good faith to satisfy the claims of our citizens, and it is hoped to carry out the other provisions of the conventions. Still, I thought it was proper to submit them to the Senate, by which they were ratified on the 3rd of March, 1859. The ratified copies, however, did not reach Shanghai until after the departure of our Minister to Peking, and these conventions could not, therefore, be exchanged at the same time with the principal treaty. No doubt is entertained that they will be ratified and exchanged by the Chinese Government, should this be thought advisable; but, under the circumstances presented, I shall consider them binding engagements from their date on both parties, and cause them to be published as such for the information and guidance of our

[T]

merchants trading with the Chinese empire.

"FOREIGN RELATIONS. — Our relations with the great empires of France and Russia, as well as with all other Governments on the continent of Europe, unless we may except that of Spain, happily continue to be of the most friendly character.

"In my last annual Message I presented a statement of the unsatisfactory condition of our relations with Spain; and I regret to say that this has not materially improved. Without special reference to other claims, even the 'Cuban claims,' the payment of which has been ably urged by our Ministers, and in which more than a hundred of our citizens are directly interested, remain unsatisfied, notwithstanding both their justice and their amount (128,635 dols. 54 cents) had been recognized and ascertained by the Spanish Government itself.

"I again recommend that an appropriation be made 'to be paid to the Spanish Government for the purpose of distribution among the claimants in the *Amistad* case.' In common with two of my predecessors, I entertain a doubt that this is required by our treaty with Spain of the 27th of October, 1795. The failure to discharge this obligation has been employed by the Cabinet of Madrid as a reason against the settlement of our claims.

"I need not repeat the arguments which I urged in my last annual Message in favour of the acquisition of Cuba by fair purchase. My opinions on that measure remain unchanged. I therefore again invite the serious attention of Congress to this im-

portant subject. Without a recognition of this policy on their part, it will be almost impossible to institute negotiations with any reasonable prospect of success."

"ISLAND OF SAN JUAN. — Until a recent period, there was good reason to believe that I should be able to announce to you on the present occasion that our difficulties with Great Britain, arising out of the Clayton and Bulwer Treaty, had been finally adjusted in a manner alike honourable and satisfactory to both parties. From causes, however, which the British Government had not anticipated, they have not yet completed treaty arrangements with the republics of Honduras and Nicaragua, in pursuance of the understanding between the two Governments. It is, nevertheless, confidently expected that this good work will ere long be accomplished.

"While indulging the hope that no other subject remained which could disturb the good understanding between the two countries, the question arising out of the adverse claims of the parties to the Island of San Juan, under the Oregon Treaty of the 15th of June, 1846, suddenly assumed a threatening prominence. In order to prevent unfortunate collisions on that remote frontier, the late Secretary of State, on the 17th of July, 1855, addressed a note to Mr. Crampton, then British Minister at Washington, communicating to him a copy of the instructions which he (Mr. Marcy) had given, on the 14th of July, to Governor Stevens, of Washington Territory, having a special reference to an 'apprehended conflict between our citizens and

the British subjects on the Island of San Juan.'

"To prevent this, the Governor was instructed 'that the officers of the territory should abstain from all acts on the disputed grounds which are calculated to provoke any conflicts, so far as it can be done without implying the concession to the authorities of Great Britain of an exclusive right over the premises. The title ought to be settled before either party should attempt to exclude the other by force, or exercise complete and exclusive sovereign rights within the fairly disputed limits.'

"In acknowledging the receipt on the next day of Mr. Marcy's note, the British Minister expressed his entire concurrence 'in the propriety of the course recommended to the Governor of Washington territory by your (Mr. Marcy's) instructions to that officer,' and stating that he had 'lost no time in transmitting a copy of that document to the Governor - General of British North America,' and had 'earnestly recommended to his Excellency to take such measures as to him may appear best calculated to secure, on the part of the British local authorities and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood of the line in question, the exercise of the same spirit of forbearance which is inculcated by you (Mr. Marcy) on the authorities and citizens of the United States.'

"Thus matters remained upon the faith of this arrangement until the 9th of July last, when General Harney paid a visit to the island. He found upon it twenty-five American residents with their families, and also an

establishment of the Hudson's Bay Company for the purpose of raising sheep. A short time before his arrival, one of these residents had shot an animal belonging to the Company, while trespassing upon his premises, for which, however, he offered to pay twice its value; but that was refused. Soon after 'the chief factor of the Company at Victoria, Mr. Dalles, son-in-law of Governor Douglas, came to the island in the British sloop-of-war *Satellite*, and threatened to take this American (Mr. Cutler) by force to Victoria, to answer for the trespass he had committed. The American seized his rifle, and told Mr. Dalles if any such attempt was made he would kill him on the spot. The affair then ended.'

"Under these circumstances, the American settlers presented a petition to the General, 'through the United States Inspector of Customs, Mr. Hubbs, to place a force upon the island to protect them from the Indians as well as the oppressive interference of the authorities of the Hudson Bay Company at Victoria with their rights as American citizens.' The General immediately responded to this petition, and ordered Captain George E. Pickett, 9th Infantry, 'to establish his company on Bellevue, or San Juan Island, on some suitable position near the harbour at the south-eastern extremity.' This order was promptly obeyed, and a military post was established at the place designated. The force was afterwards increased, so that by the last return the whole number of troops then on the island amounted in the aggregate to 691 men.

"While I do not deem it pro-

per on the present occasion to go further into the subject and discuss the weight which ought to be attached to the statements of the British colonial authorities, contesting the accuracy of the information on which the gallant General acted, it was due to him that I should thus present his own reasons for issuing the order to Captain Pickett. From these it is quite clear his object was to prevent the British authorities on Vancouver's Island from exercising jurisdiction over American residents on the Island of San Juan, as well as to protect them against the incursions of the Indians.

"Much excitement prevailed for some time throughout that region, and serious danger of collision between the parties was apprehended. The British had a large naval force in the vicinity, and it is but an act of simple justice to the admiral on that station to state that he wisely and discreetly forbore to commit any hostile act, but determined to refer the whole affair to his Government, and await their instructions.

"Entertaining no doubt of the validity of our title, I need scarcely add, that, in any event, American citizens were to be placed on a footing at least as favourable as that of British subjects, it being understood that Captain Pickett's company should remain on the island. It is proper to observe that, considering the distance from the scene of action, and in ignorance of what might have transpired on the spot before the General's arrival, it was necessary to leave much to his discretion, and I am happy to state the event has

proved that this discretion could not have been intrusted to more competent hands. General Scott has recently returned from his mission, having successfully accomplished its objects, and there is no longer any good reason to apprehend a collision between the forces of the two countries during the pendency of the existing negotiations.

"MEXICO.—I regret to inform you that there has been no improvement in the affairs of Mexico since my last annual Message, and I am again obliged to ask the earnest attention of Congress to the unhappy condition of that Republic."

[Here followed a long exposition of the grievances of the United States Government against Mexico, and the Message then proceeded.]

"The wrongs which we have suffered from Mexico are before the world, and must deeply impress every American citizen. A Government which is either unable or unwilling to redress such wrongs, is derelict to its highest duties. The difficulty consists in selecting and enforcing the remedy. We may in vain apply to the Constitutional Government at Vera Cruz, although it is well disposed to do justice, for adequate redress. While its authority is acknowledged in all the important ports, and throughout the seacoast of the Republic, its power does not extend to the city of Mexico and the States in its vicinity, where nearly all the recent outrages have been committed on American citizens. We must penetrate into the interior before we can reach the offenders, and this can only be done by passing through the territory in

the occupation of the Constitutional Government. The most acceptable and least difficult mode of accomplishing the object will be to act in concert with that Government. Their consent and their aid might, I believe, be obtained; but if not, our obligation to protect our own citizens in their just rights, secured by treaty, would not be the less imperative. For these reasons, I recommend to Congress to pass a law authorizing the President, under such conditions as they may deem expedient, to employ a sufficient military force to enter Mexico for the purpose of obtaining indemnity for the past and security for the future. I purposely refrain from any suggestions as to whether this force shall consist of regular troops or volunteers, or both. This question may be most appropriately left to the decision of Congress. I would merely observe, that should volunteers be selected, such a force could be easily raised in this country among those who sympathize with the sufferings of our unfortunate fellow-citizens in Mexico, and with the unhappy condition of that republic. Such an access to the forces of the Constitutional Government would enable it soon to reach the city of Mexico, and extend its power over the whole republic. In that event there is no reason to doubt that the just claims of our citizens would be satisfied, and adequate redress obtained for the injuries inflicted upon them. The Constitutional Government have ever evinced a strong desire to do us justice, and this might be secured in advance by a preliminary treaty.

"It may be said that these

measures will, at least indirectly, be inconsistent with our wise and settled policy not to interfere in the domestic concerns of other nations. But does not the present case fairly constitute an exception? An adjoining republic is in a state of anarchy and confusion, from which she has proved wholly unable to extricate herself. She is entirely destitute of the power to maintain peace upon her borders, or to prevent the incursions of banditti into our territory. In her fate and in her fortune—in her power to establish and maintain a settled Government—we have a far deeper interest, socially, commercially, and politically, than any other nation. She is now a wreck upon the ocean, drifting about as she is impelled by different factions. As a good neighbour shall we not extend to her a helping hand to save her? If we do not, it would not be surprising should some other nation undertake the task, and thus force us to interfere at last, under circumstances of increased difficulty, for the maintenance of our established policy.

"REFUSAL OF SUPPLIES.—The thirty-fifth Congress terminated on the 3rd of March, 1859, without having passed the 'Act making appropriations for the service of the Post-office department during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1860.' This Act also contained an appropriation 'to supply deficiencies in the revenue of the Post-office department for the year ending the 30th of June, 1859.' I believe this is the first instance since the origin of the Federal Government, now more than seventy years ago, when any Congress

went out of existence without having passed all the general appropriation bills necessary to carry on the government until the regular period for the meeting of a new Congress. This event imposed on the Executive a grave responsibility. It presented a choice of evils . . .

"The failure to pass the Post-office Bill necessarily gives birth to serious reflections. Congress, by refusing to pass the general appropriation Bills necessary to carry on the government, may not only arrest its action, but might even destroy its existence. The army, the navy, the judiciary—in short, every department of the Government—can no longer perform their functions if Congress refuse the money necessary for their support. If this failure should teach the country the necessity of electing a full Congress in sufficient time to enable the President to convene them in any emergency, even immediately after the old Congress has expired, it will have been productive of great good. In a time of sudden and alarming danger, foreign or domestic, which all nations must expect to encounter in their progress, the very salvation of our institutions may be staked upon the assembling of Congress without delay. If, under such circumstances, the President should find himself in the condition in which he was placed at the close of the last Congress, with nearly half the States of the Union destitute of representatives, the consequences might be disastrous. I therefore recommend to Congress to carry into effect the provisions of the Constitution on this subject, and to pass a law appointing some

day previous to the 4th of March in each year, of odd number, for the election of representatives throughout all the States. They have already appointed a day for the election of electors for President and Vice-President, and this measure has been approved by the country.

"FINANCE.—We have scarcely recovered from the habits of extravagant expenditure produced by our overflowing Treasury during several years prior to the commencement of my administration. The financial reverses which we have since experienced ought to teach us all to scrutinize our expenditures with the greatest vigilance, and to reduce them to the lowest possible point. The Executive Departments of the Government have devoted themselves to the accomplishment of this object with considerable success, as will appear from their different reports and estimates. To these I invite the scrutiny of Congress, for the purpose of reducing them still lower, if this be practicable, consistent with the great public interests of the country. In aid of the policy of retrenchment, I pledge myself to examine closely the Bills appropriating lands or money, so that, if any of these should inadvertently pass both Houses, as must sometimes be the case, I may afford them an opportunity for reconsideration. At the same time we ought never to forget that true public economy consists, not in withholding the means necessary to accomplish important national objects confided to us by the Constitution, but in taking care that the money appropriated for these purposes shall be faithfully and frugally expended.

“It will appear from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury that it is extremely doubtful, to say the least, whether we shall be able to pass through the present and the next fiscal year without providing additional revenue. This can only be accomplished by strictly confining the appropriations within the estimates of the different departments, without making an allowance for any additional expenditures which Congress may think proper, in their discretion, to authorize, and without providing for the redemption of any portion of the 20,000,000 dols. of Treasury notes which have been already issued. In the event of a deficiency, which I consider probable, this ought never to be

supplied by a resort to additional loans. It would be a ruinous practice in the days of peace and prosperity to go on increasing the national debt to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. This policy would cripple our resources and impair our credit in case the existence of war should render it necessary to borrow money. Should such a deficiency occur as I apprehend, I would recommend that the necessary revenue be raised by an increase of our present duties on imports. I need not repeat the opinions expressed in my last annual Message as to the best mode and manner of accomplishing this object, and shall now merely observe that these have since undergone no change.”

CHRONICLE.

JANUARY, 1859.

RETURN OF WRECKS, 1858.—The Abstract of Returns of Wrecks and Casualties on and near the Coasts of the United Kingdom, during the year 1858, published by the Board of Trade, gives us the total number of wrecks and strandings as 869, being an increase of three only over those of the previous year. Of these 354 were total losses. The number of total losses by collision were 50; of damage by the same cause 251; making the total of casualties 1170. The tonnage of these vessels amounted to 205,243 tons; and the number of hands on board them 8979. As to their nationality, 927 were British, 30 colonial, 209 foreign, 4 unknown. Forty-nine of the whole were steam-ships. As to dimensions, 199 did not exceed 50 tons; 352 were under 100; 467 under 300; 96 under 600; 28 under 900; 23 under 1200; 5 exceeded 500 tons.

Of these disasters 124 occurred in January—116 in February—148 in March—115 in April—48 in May—30 in June—61 in July—33 in August—91 in September—148 in October—120 in November—136 in December.

VOL. CI.

The most fatal localities were :

	Vessels.
East Coast—Dungeness to Pentland Frith	514
West Coast—Land's End to Greenock	304
South Coast—Land's End to Dungeness	89
Irish Coast	168
Scilly Islands	14
Lundy Island	15
Isle of Man	6
Northern Isles, Orkney, &c.	60
Total	1170

The number of lives in actual peril (as far as can be known) was 1895. Of these 340 only were lost. Of the 1555 persons saved, 206 were rescued by life-boats, 210 by the rocket and mortar apparatus. Twenty-six were rescued by meritorious individual exertions; the remaining 1113 by ships, steamers, small craft, and coast-guard boats.

The disasters by which the greatest loss of life was incurred were the *Merchant*, near Shields, 11 seamen and pilot drowned; *Leander*, off Bardsey, 10; *Brigand*, steamer, between Wicklow and Kish bank, 28; *Wingrave*, off Aldborough, 10; *Cuba*, steamer, off Scilly, 16; *Bombay*, at sea, 13.

B

The cost of maintaining the rocket and mortar apparatus at 216 stations is 2024*l.*; payments to crews of life-boats, including 634*l.* presented to the Royal Native Life-Boat Institution in aid of placing new boats on the coast of Ireland and replacing one at Holyhead, 2115*l.*; rewards paid to meritorious persons not connected with life boats, 382*l.* Making the total expenditure out of the Mercantile Marine Fund towards saving life from shipwreck 4523*l.*

The number of boats under the management of the National Life-Boat Institution, 73 being subsidized by the Board of Trade, is 81; under other management, 68: total, 149.

THE WEATHER.—The weather during the autumn quarter has presented some peculiarities: for while the temperature of October and December was somewhat above the average, in November the cold has been exceeded in only twelve out of 87 preceding Novembers. On the 21th the lowest temperature recorded at many stations was below 20°, and at Royston it was as low as 11°. The fall of rain has been constantly deficient in each month; the fall in the quarter being 3·1 inches, showing a deficiency of 4·5 inches from the average. The deficiency extends over the whole year, the total fall being no more than 17·2 inches; whereas in 1855 it was 23·5 inches, in 1856 21·5 inches, in 1857 21·4 inches: the rainfall of 1858, indeed, is the lowest since 1840.

PRICE OF PROVISIONS, AND POPULATION.—The price of provisions has fallen throughout the year.

The average price of wheat in the last thirteen weeks was 41*s.* 9*d.*; in 1856, it was 63*s.* 4*d.*; and in 1857, 52*s.* The price of meat varied but little. Potatoes, at the water-side, 87*s.* 6*d.* a ton, or 37 per cent. cheaper than in 1857, and 12 per cent. cheaper than in 1856.

Notwithstanding the favourable circumstances of fine weather and cheap food, the Quarterly Return of the Registrar-General indicates an unfavourable aspect of the population—marriages below the average, and deaths much above the average — 118,663 deaths against 110,697 in 1857.

The valuable returns of the Registrar-General present information of great interest, both as to the quarter and the year. In the autumn quarter of 1858 the number of in-door paupers receiving relief was 115,751; of out-door paupers, 710,904: total, 826,655. In 1856, the totals were 869,027; in 1857, 882,498. The average is about 4½ per cent. of the population.

The population of England and Wales in the middle of 1858 is estimated at 19,576,950. The deaths, taken at the rate of comparatively-healthy districts, *should* not have exceeded 349,398: they were 450,018: the excess of 100,620 deaths is due chiefly to the fatal neglect of the sanitary arrangements which are required in every district, and are indispensable in densely-peopled cities.

“We must not shut our eyes,” says the Registrar-General, “to the fact that one great nuisance perpetually increases as the population increases, and that no effectual provision has yet been

made for getting rid of it from human dwellings. It is referred to several times in the notes of the registrars in towns which have been most heavily afflicted. Liebig, the great agricultural chemist of Europe, has recently reminded us of English guano as a substitute for foreign supplies. 'I am firmly of opinion,' he says, 'that if England wishes to remain an agricultural country she must use as manure the nightsoil and similar residues produced in large cities.' Now England is a great agricultural country, and she will remain a great agricultural country to the end of time. And before the supplies of Peruvian guano fail in our imports, she must bring the article which may be called English guano into the field. It is poison alike in the cesspools of large cities, and in the middens of cottages in the country; it is manure in the soil. The land requires it; the houses must get rid of it."

THE WINTER QUARTER.—The winter of 1858-9 may be very briefly summed up; it was by far the warmest that has been known for at least three-quarters of a century; in fact, since the period at which trustworthy records commence. On the 10th of January a period of warm weather commenced, which extended throughout the quarter. The mean of the three months ending March was $43^{\circ} 3$; while the average of the 88 years since 1771 for the same quarter was $38^{\circ} 4$; the excess of the whole quarter was therefore nearly 5° . The barometer stood generally high; and the fall of rain, except in certain localities, greatly in defect. On the 30th of March there was a heavy snow-

storm; but the fallen flakes speedily thawed, and the country was rendered slushy and miserable.

While the poor were thus spared the misery of a cold winter, they were equally fortunate in respect to the price of food. Wheat, which in the winter quarter of 1857, was 56s. 10d. a qr., and in 1858 46s. 5d. a qr., now fell to 40s. 8d. a qr. Potatoes—a still more important article of food to these classes—were 90s. a ton, instead of 110s. and 152s. 6d. as in the two preceding years. The health of the population, although better than in the corresponding period of 1858, when the weather was unusually severe, was, nevertheless, below the average. That the excessive mortality was not due to any deficiency in the earnings or wealth of the community is ascertained by the marriage test, the number of marriages in ratio to the population having considerably increased.

GREAT CONFLAGRATION AT VALPARAISO.—The West-Indian mail brings intelligence of a dreadful conflagration, which, on the 13th November, destroyed a large part of Valparaiso, together with an immense quantity of merchandise. As the business of this place is carried on in a great degree by English capital and English houses, the property was very largely insured in the English offices; and of damage estimated to amount to 3,000,000 dollars, about 282,000*l.* falls upon our underwriters.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAMS.—For the last two years the electric telegrams from India have been given in this CHRONICLE. This course was adopted because it appeared that without them these pages

could not be a faithful reflex of the "incidents" of the times. The fearfully-interesting nature of the intelligence they conveyed, and the effect they produced on the public feeling and on the money-market made their arrival events of the year; and their news is far different in character from the accurate and connected narrative proper to the History. With the great victories in India, by which the revolt in our Eastern empire had been in effect subdued, the value of this notation of the national time had passed away, and it was necessary to preserve in this volume only such Indian telegrams as contained events of great importance. This soul-stirring episode, however, had scarcely passed away when the public mind was agitated by a new drama, in which, if the incidents came less home to our national and domestic feelings, the curiosity of the public and the interests of commerce were very deeply interested. It has, therefore, been deemed expedient to preserve the record of the most important events of the Italian war in the very words and at the very moment in which they reached us. Had it been possible for the historian to know thus accurately the great incidents of former history, many prejudices, passions, and feelings which have had an enduring effect, although not justified or explained by after records or documentary evidence, would have been explicable.

1. TELEGRAM FROM INDIA.—
(Received at the Foreign Office at 11 P.M.)

Alexandria, Dec. 25, 1858.

"The amnesty is slowly but

surely thinning the ranks of the rebels, and there is good reason for believing that the whole country will be restored to peace without much additional bloodshed.

"On the 4th of November (24th?) a force commanded by Lord Clyde in person, having marched 61 miles in 60 hours, completely defeated Bainie Madhoo Sing, and a large army of rebels at Dundeca Klara, nearly opposite Futtehpore. The enemy was driven out of the dense jungle, and afterwards chased four miles by guns and cavalry: their loss was enormous; many were drowned in the Ganges. Bainie Madhoo fled down the river Oomrao. Sing escaped towards the Cawnpore road. The rabble threw away their arms, and fled to the steep ravines in which the Younksy abounds.

"Bainie Madhoo is said now to be at Doleemou Ghaat on the Ganges.

"On the 28th of November the Commander-in-Chief arrived at Lucknow. The health of our troops is said to be excellent.

"On the 21st of November General Grant recrossed the Gourtee (Goomtee?); the rebels in considerable numbers disputed the passage, but were forced to fly with great loss. Six of their guns were taken.

"Tantia Topee continues to avoid the ingenuity of his pursuers.

"He is said to have entered Guzurat.

"The *Bombay Gazette* announces the death of General John Jacob, on the 6th of December, from an attack of brain fever.

"A. FANSHAW, Vice-Admiral."

3. TERRIBLE ACCIDENT AT THE POLYTECHNIC.—An accident, which, though it involved injuries to nearly 40 persons, yet resulted in only one death, occurred at that very popular place of instruction and amusement the Polytechnic Institution, in Regent Street. The rational character of this exhibition brings within its walls, during the Christmas holidays, a large number of persons. On boxing-day there were as many as 5000 visitors. On the subsequent days the frequenters were not so numerous, but were in large part young persons of the better classes. On the evening of this disaster, some 700 or 800 persons were in the large theatre, witnessing a series of dissolving views illustrative of the history of Don Quixote. The access to this room is by a geometrical stone-staircase of three angular flights, one end of the steps of which were let into the wall, an iron rail running down the other. The entertainment concluded about half-past 10, and the audience were leaving the place. Happily by far the greater part had safely reached the street; but there were some still descending from the gallery of the theatre, when in an instant, and without the slightest warning, the whole of the flights of stairs gave way, and the stones, and rails, and all the unhappy persons upon them fell in one confused mass on to the ground-floor. Their number is supposed to have been about 50, chiefly young persons; and it is matter for the utmost astonishment that the loss of life was not terrible. The whole of those who fell with the stairs were more or less injured, but not a single

person was killed on the spot. The injuries suffered by 30 persons were so serious that they were, in the first instance, taken to the Middlesex Hospital, but after their wounds had been dressed, all but seven were sent to their own homes. Of these seven it does not appear that more than one, a child of 10 years, died.

A very lengthened inquiry was held into the cause of this catastrophe, which, though depending much upon professional observation, appears to have been sufficiently ascertained.

It seems that nearly a year before the attention of the directors had been called to the worn state of the steps of the staircase, caused by the attrition of the feet of the numerous visitors; and they accordingly instructed their architect to suggest the means of renovating them. The plan adopted appeared well calculated to render the steps safe and to preserve a handsome appearance. It was to let into each step an iron trellis bedded in Portland cement. For this purpose it was necessary to cut away a portion of the upper surface of each step of the size of the iron trellis. It is evident that such a proceeding would actually weaken the strength of each stone proportionately to each incision; but every one also knows the effect that a notch or cut has upon stone or glass in rendering it easily frangible at that line. It also appeared that there was some defect in the construction of the stairs, by the "joggle joint" being imperfect. As to the cause of the accident, it seems that the lower flight of stairs, being unable to bear the impulsion of the nume-

rous feet of the descending visitors, gave way, snapping at the notches, and that the upper flights, thus deprived of their support below, and insecure by reason of the defective "joggle joint," also snapped instantaneously, at the same notches. It appeared also that some of the stones had broken at points where large fossils were imbedded.

The proprietors of this very useful educational institution, beside the heavy loss the accident inflicted on them directly, were subjected to numerous actions for damages by parties who had received injury.

4. FATAL COLLIERY ACCIDENTS.

—On the morning of the 4th instant, a shocking accident occurred at the Agecroft Colliery, at Pendlebury, near Manchester. It appears that the first week of the New Year is taken as a holiday by a large number of the colliers, and as very few of the men descended to their work on Tuesday, it was determined that only a small quantity of coal should be obtained that morning. About 9 o'clock the foreman gave the order to cease working. Three men and four boys accordingly entered the cage, which is raised to the surface with great velocity by a high-pressure steam-engine. A string attached to the axle of the wheel communicates with the engine-house, and rings an alarm bell when the cage is within about sixty yards of the mouth of the pit, as a signal to the engineer to slacken speed and use caution. On the present occasion, however, it is alleged that this contrivance must have been out of order, for the bell did not sound, and the cage arriving at full speed at the top, struck

against the scaffolding with great violence, so that the machinery snapped, and the cage fell to the bottom of the shaft, a distance of 360 yards. All its occupants were killed on the spot.

On the 25th a similar accident occurred in a pit near Wolverhampton. As two men were descending the pit the chain broke, and the skip, with the two unfortunate men, was precipitated to the bottom, and both occupants were killed.

5. TORTURE AND EXECUTION OF A FRENCH BISHOP IN TONQUIN.—The *Hong Kong Register* gives an account of the murder or martyrdom of Monsignor Melchior, a French missionary bishop, at the capital of Tonquin. The venerable prelate was taken on the 8th of July, with two native servants, and was exposed to great cruelties and indignities. On the 27th, the two servants were led to the place of execution, which was surrounded by a mass of foot-soldiers, cavalry, and elephants. The poor men were tied to posts in such a manner as to subject them to great torture. In the meanwhile the bishop was led through the streets with a heavy chain round his neck. He was then brought to the place of execution, where his servants were executed in his presence.

"Let us now pass on to the horrible torture suffered by the venerable bishop. The two servants having been executed, the executioners stretched a mat on the ground, placed a small carpet upon it, broke the chain which was round the neck of his eminence, and made him lie down on his back upon the matting. The bishop wore at this time

nothing but a pair of trousers turned up to the thighs. The victim being thus placed, the executioner took two stakes, which he fixed in the ground on each side of him, and to which his hands were tightly bound by cords, causing great pain. Two others were then placed under his armpits, and crossed over the chest of the bishop so as to press it tightly. Two other posts were then set up at a short distance from his foot. The cords with which the feet were bound were passed round these posts and stretched violently, the feet being then pegged down; the loins were similarly secured. It would be difficult to conceive the tortures of the venerable prelate thus bound and racked. An order was then issued first to cut off the feet, then the hands, afterwards the head of the martyr, and lastly to eviscerate him. At this order five executioners commenced their frightful duty. They were armed with a kind of bill-hook or hatchet purposely blunted in order to inflict greater suffering. They commenced by cutting off the legs above the knees, each limb receiving about twelve blows before it was severed. The same process was repeated with the arms. But the power of speech now failed the happy martyr, who, so long as strength remained, had not ceased to call on the name of Jesus. His head was then struck off, after repeated blows, and lastly his body was opened and his entrails drawn out with a hook."

The sufferer's head was exposed for some days on the southern gate of Nan-dinh, and then broken to pieces and thrown

into the sea. A similar execution of a French bishop took place in the same city about two years before.

11. FALL OF A SHOP AT LIVERPOOL.—*Five Lives lost.*—The mania, which has so materially altered the street aspect of London, for pulling down the snug and inexpensive shops in which our forefathers realized comfortable fortunes, in order to replace them with showy insubstantial fabrics, has, according to custom, extended to the provincial capitals.

At Liverpool, in Great George Street, is—not an ungenteel "shop"—but a genteel "Bazaar," in which Mr. Lewis carried on a flourishing business as a draper and hosier. Indulging in the prevailing taste, Mr. Lewis had built, in the rear of his old-fashioned premises a large "hall;" carrying on his business in the meanwhile in his front shop. The hall being completed, he next proceeded to connect it with the front by pulling down the intermediate back rooms. As these alterations necessarily involved removal and damage to his stock-in-trade, Mr. Lewis took the opportunity of getting rid of his stale stores and unsaleable commodities by announcing a "great reduction" and an "enormous sacrifice," and the advertisement of course brought a great number of women to purchase cheap articles that they did not want. Economical in his extravagances, Mr. Lewis employed no regular architect, but merely common workmen. They had removed the flooring and joists, which, of course, acted as struts. At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, while the front shop was

full of customers, the back walls, deprived of their proper internal supports, collapsed, and fell in a hideous ruin into the front premises, carrying away a large part of the flooring, counters, shelving and stock, and, unfortunately, a considerable number of human beings, into the cellar below. The sacrifice of life might have been very great; but happily the greater part were drawn out from the *débris* with injuries short of mortal. But two female customers, mother and daughter, a shopman, and two of the labourers were killed; and seven persons were seriously injured.

Two days afterwards, in the same town, two other lives were sacrificed to gentility. In Titheborne Street, a "public house" was undergoing conversion into an "hotel." While the workmen were taking off the roof the joists fell, carried away two floors below, and the house resolved itself to a heap of ruins in the cellar. Two of the workmen were killed.

FALL OF HOUSES AT KENTISH TOWN.—There has been another exemplification of the unsubstantial manner in which the immense additions to the metropolis are run up. On the right-hand side of the Kentish-town Road, on the site known as the Kentish-town Fields, near the toll-gate, some extensive building operations are going on, and a series of new streets are in formation. In one of these streets a number of superior class houses are in course of erection. The bricklayers, although the fronts of the houses were by no means finished, had carried up the party walls, and the stacks of chimneys thereon were so far completed that the ceremony of hoisting the

flags, made of workmen's handkerchiefs, was duly performed, and some few of the chimneypots only remained to be set to complete the work, so as to entitle the men to the usual regalement of beer on such occasions. The stack of the third house from the corner is stated to have been much higher than those of the adjoining houses, and while one man was fixing the last chimneypot there, the entire stack, from some unexplained cause, fell, dragging with it a great portion of the upper part of the party wall; and these falling over to the next party wall and stack caused that also to fall in the same direction, carrying away a portion of the third stack and party wall, together with the whole of the scaffoldings and their occupants. The fall of the buildings and materials caused so tremendous a noise that a body of police instantly hastened to the spot, and set to work to rescue the unfortunate workmen from the ruins. Three of them were found to be so severely injured, with arms and legs broken, that they were conveyed to the University College Hospital. Numerous others, whose hurts were not so severe, were taken to their own homes.

23. LOSS OF THE "CZAR" STEAM-SHIP. — During a heavy gale which prevailed on the south coast of England, the steam-ship *Czar*, of 937 tons, laden with valuable Government stores, shot and shell, for Malta, foundered off the Lizard, and the commander, his wife and son, passengers, and several of the crew, in all fourteen persons, perished with her. She had encountered the heavy gale with success, until the

steam-pipe unfortunately broke. The captain attempted to put back to Falmouth; but the vessel was unmanageable, and about 3 P.M. drove on the Vogue Rock, near the Lizard Point. The coast-guard observed the disaster, and launched their boat with their usual gallantry, and saved six of the crew. Eleven others saved themselves in the ship's life-boat. The captain was taking measures for the safety of his wife and son and the remainder of the crew, when the vessel suddenly broke and foundered, and all perished.

In the same gale the Ham-burgh bark *Diana* was driven ashore near Chichester harbour; but the crew were saved by the gallantry of the coast-guard.

25. CENTENARY ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BURNS.—On this day Scotchmen, wherever placed by the accidents of fortune—whether in the frozen regions of Iceland or Patagonia, or the torrid zones of the tropics, or whether more happy in the “land of the mountain and the flood”—celebrated the hundredth return of the birth-day of their national poet, the inspired ploughman, Robert Burns.

As was fitting, the principal feasts were made at Edinburgh and Glasgow, the former under the presidency of Lord Ardmillan, the latter of Sir Archibald Alison. In every burgh in Scotland high festival was held. Ayr and Allo-way (the poet's birth-place) are especially to be noted.

In like manner in England, the natives of Scotland publicly commemorated the occasion in most of the large towns. In the metropolis, the Caledonian Society celebrated the day, as the

accredited representatives of the Scotch resident in England. There was also a meeting in the city.

The most popular and general commemoration was undoubtedly “The Burns' Festival” at the Crystal Palace. To this beautiful and wonderful building, which, in the depth of winter, preserved nearly the atmosphere and cheerfulness of a southern clime, many thousands of persons, Scotch and English, thronged. Among the great attractions prepared for the visitors were a large and interesting collection of Burns' relics. These were placed in a court, in the centre of which a colossal bust of the poet, modelled by Calder Marshall, R.A., was raised upon a pedestal; a concert, consisting entirely of the poet's songs; and it was announced that the successful competitor for a prize of 50*l.* for an ode in honour of Burns would be announced. This was the great event of the day, and breathless was the interest felt by the vast multitude as Mr. Phelps advanced with a sealed packet, which contained the name of the poet who was deemed most worthy to commemorate a poet whom the world had not forgotten after the lapse of a century. The successful competitor proved to be an amiable Scotch lady, well known in literature, Miss Isa Craig. The announcement was received with great applause. Then Mr. Phelps declaimed the ode itself, which was heard with approbation. As the poem affords one of those examples so rare in modern times, but so dear to the earlier volumes of the ANNUAL REGISTER, an “Occasional Piece,” it will be found included in the “Poetry”

of this volume. The public amusements of the day being concluded, the visitors amused themselves with singing Scotch songs, dancing Scotch reels, talking and thinking Scotch, and eating dinners, from which the Scotch delicacies of haggis, "sheep's-head singeit," cock-a-leekie, collops, Ayrshire puddings, and genuine Glenlivat, were not omitted.

Miss Isa Craig is a native of Edinburgh, who, her friends not being rich, with praiseworthy industry and self-reliance trusted herself to the resources of a strong and cultivated intellect. Having acquired some repute as a contributor to the *Scotsman* and *The National Magazine*, Miss Craig removed to London, where her talents were usefully employed by the National Association of Social Science; in which, and in other literary labours, this lady gained general notice and commendation.

27. ACCOUCHEMENT OF THE PRINCESS FREDERICK WILLIAM.—At 3 P.M., the Princess Frederick William of Prussia, Princess Royal of England, gave birth to a son at Berlin; and the subsequent bulletins announced that the Royal mother and child were doing well. Her Majesty received at Windsor Castle the intelligence of the birth of her grandson at Berlin by the time he was *six minutes* old. Her Majesty, a grandmother at 40, is now already in the second rank of a family consisting of four existing generations.

30. GREAT FIRE AT SHEFFIELD.—An extensive conflagration has destroyed the premises of Mr. Unwin, a timber-merchant and furniture dealer, in the

West-bar, Sheffield. The fire broke out at about 10 o'clock at night, and, from the combustible nature of the materials, spread with great rapidity. The large area which was covered with piles of timber and extensive workshops was speedily wrapped in flames, which rose high above the town, and illuminated all the adjacent country. Mr. Unwin's premises were surrounded by lofty walls and massive buildings, whereby the mischief was confined to this locality. The damage done is estimated to exceed 10,000*l*.

FEBRUARY.

1. MURDER, SUICIDE, AND ARSON AT MANCHESTER.—A terrible tragedy has been perpetrated at a beer-shop in Albert Street, Manchester. A man named Robinson, with his wife and two daughters, one about 20 and the other about 16 years old, kept a beer-house, known as the Cross-Keys, a small low place, but in which he did a good business. The daughters worked at a factory, from which they did not return until the evening. They left home for work as usual at an early hour. Robinson also worked as a mute or bearer for undertakers, and left in the course of the morning for a job of this kind, and returned about 1 o'clock; after which he is known to have drunk considerably.

Nothing is known of what took place until about 3 o'clock, when a woman named Saxon, who, with her mother, occupied a front and back cellar under the beer-shop,

states that she heard a heavy fall overhead, which startled her; that very soon afterwards she saw blood dropping through the ceiling; that she then said to her mother that "he must have been killing her," alluding to Robinson and his wife; but that her mother advised her not to do anything "until the girls came home."

Mrs. Saxon further states that about 4 o'clock she saw Robinson walking up and down Albert-street in front of his house, and that he had then locked his front door, but had no hat on. She spoke to him and asked "Where is Mrs. Robinson?" and on his answering "I don't know; I think she must have gone to our Eliza's." Mrs. Saxon rejoined, "No; she never has." Still the woman gave no alarm; indeed she says that she left Robinson in the street, "with the tears rolling down his cheeks like a bewildered man."

Nothing more was known until the daughters returned home, about a quarter before 7 o'clock. They were astonished at finding the house in darkness and the front door locked; and they were terrified at the tale which Mrs. Saxon told them. The aid of two neighbours was obtained; a back door was forced, and the house was entered. The place was found suffocatingly full of gas; but the light of the fire in the back room revealed the lifeless body of Mrs. Robinson stretched upon the flagged floor in front of the grate, and covered with blood. Before any further light was obtained, the windows and doors were thrown open, to avoid an explosion from the gas which filled the place. Then it was found that, in addition to the committal of a horrible murder,

an attempt to burn down the premises had been made; the gas of all the burners was turned full on, and pieces of timber had been placed on the fire in such a manner that when fully ignited they would have fallen into the room, and probably set fire to the contents; they had, however, fallen harmlessly.

A search of the premises showed that after committing the murder, and attempting to fire the house, Robinson had very deliberately, and very effectually, committed suicide. At the top of the steep, dark staircase, there is a trap-door, giving access, by means of a ladder, to an attic in which Robinson kept pigeons. Into the wall of the staircase, below the trap-door, a nail had been driven in order to steady the ladder. From this nail the murderer's corpse was found swinging by a light but strong rope. He must have deliberately placed the ladder against the wall, ascended it, and fastened the upper end of the rope to the nail, and then kicked the ladder from beneath him.

The murdered woman was found to have received four terrible wounds in the neck, as though a sharp-pointed weapon had been violently thrust or "jobbed" into that part. One of those wounds, just behind the line of the left ear, appeared to have penetrated the vertebral column, and would cause instant death. In the fire in the back room, the police discovered a knife, ground off to a long tapering point, and apparently such as would be used by a shoemaker; the handle had disappeared. This was in all probability the weapon used by the murderer.

Robinson was a man of very

furious passions, which rose into frenzy when he had had too much liquor; and frequently treated his wife with great brutality. He was, or affected to be, jealous of her conduct, and accused her of immoralities for which there did not appear to be any foundation.

1. CONFLAGRATION AT NOTTINGHAM.—A very destructive fire has occurred on the premises of Messrs. Hine, Mundella, and Co., hosiers, Station Street, Nottingham. About half-past 9 o'clock smoke was seen to issue from one of the windows of the factory, and an alarm of fire was immediately given. In a very short space of time the Nottingham Fire Brigade, with two engines, and a detachment of the Royal Artillery, with an engine from the cavalry barracks, arrived. The progress of the fire was stayed for some time, when it had reached a part of the building which had been made fireproof. At 11 o'clock, however, it burned through the roof, the flames lighting the country for many miles round. All attempts to save that part of the building containing the extensive machinery and uncompleted work were now at an end, and the attention of the firemen was more especially turned to the warehouse containing the finished stock. Avenues were formed, and a portion of the stock was removed into the Nottingham Railway Station; but it appearing afterwards that the ravages of the fire would be confined to the factory, the stock was allowed to remain. The fire was got under about half-past 1 o'clock, when all the machinery, factory, and unfinished goods, had been destroyed. As this factory was one

of the most extensive in Nottingham, several hundred persons are thrown out of employment. The insurances amounted to 65,000*l*. The most serious blow, therefore will fall upon the workpeople, some 300 or 400 of whom will be temporarily deprived of their means of subsistence.

2. DESTRUCTION OF THE CRINAN CANAL.—The Crinan Canal, which forms the short cut between the Clyde and the north-west coast of Scotland, has been destroyed by the bursting of the reservoirs employed to feed it. The catastrophe is thus described:—"After an unprecedented wet season, on the evening of the 2nd, about 8 o'clock, one of those reservoirs, becoming overcharged, suddenly burst and precipitated itself into the one beneath, which also giving way, the contents of both bounded into a third, and, with a roar which shook the country for miles round, an avalanche of water, rocks, and earth rolled down the mountain side, furrowing a deep watercourse in its way, and instantly obliterating the canal under a mountain of thousands of tons of rocks and stones. The vast body of water, separating into two great tide waves, rolled away to the east and west, breaking up lock-gates like tinder; and, tunnelling vast chasms through the banks, the waters found vent over the open country, the one by the town of Lochgilphead into Loch Fyne, the other over the Crinan mosses into the western sea, both strewing the face of the country with mud, stones, peat, fragments of corn-stacks, uprooted bushes, and broken timber, in a most wonderful manner. Even the loch for many miles out to sea is quite

turbid, and its surface speckled over with floating *débris*. Though the loss of property is at present incalculable, yet, most miraculously, there has not been a single life lost, though the alarm of the people of Lochgilphead may be conceived when they heard the distant bellowing of the torrent and rolling and grating of rocks, and then saw through the darkness of the night the moving flood all around them. About half-a-mile of canal is buried under a chaotic heap of Cyclopiian stones, like a rugged sea beach. In this part of Glen Crinan nature has completely resumed her sway; towpath and high road, and all appearance of the hand of man have totally disappeared. For two miles the canal is destroyed. The Crinan canal was originally undertaken by the Duke of Argyll; who, in 1815, applied to the Treasury for an advance of about 24,000*l.* to complete it, pledging the tolls as security. As the canal has rarely paid the expenses of working and repairs, it practically belongs to the nation. A vote of 12,000*l.* was accordingly taken in August to reinstate the canal in its former efficiency.

4. THE GORILLA, OR MAN MONKEY.—A specimen of this startling approach to humanity, preserved in spirits, has been received at the British Museum. The adventurous travels of the missionaries in Central Africa had made known the fact in 1847 that there existed between the equator and 20 degrees south on the western portion, an ape of gigantic size and of enormous power. The drawings sent by these persons enabled Professor Owen to pronounce that this

animal was a nearer approach to man than even the chimpanzee, and consequently comparative anatomists have been very anxious to obtain a specimen. The one now sent to Europe is only two-thirds grown. This evening Professor Owen delivered a lecture at the Royal Institution, on the animal. There were exhibited, side by side, drawings of the long-armed ape, the ourang-outang, the chimpanzee, the gorilla, and a man. The two last presented a horrible similarity, though with marked differences. The gorilla, standing erect, is about five feet high, with immense jaws, scarcely any apparent skull, the cavity of the brain being concealed by projections of bone for the attachment of the muscles of the jaws; the chest was nearly twice as capacious as that of man, and the bones of the arm were much stronger than those of the human skeleton, and reached nearly to the knee-joint. The bones of the legs were shorter, but much thicker, whilst the pelvis, the large size of which had been considered peculiar to the human form, was considerably larger than in the skeleton of man. The points in which it approaches nearer to man than any other quadrumanous animal are the shorter arm; particularly the shortness of the humerus compared with the fore-arm, a longer development of the great toe, a projecting nose-bone, and the arrangement of the bones of the feet to enable the creature to stand more erect. The food of the gorilla consists of fruits and vegetables, and its habitation is the woods, where it constructs nests of the intertwined boughs perched at heights varying from

12 feet to 50. It avoids the presence of the negroes, and is but seldom seen, but it is known to them as "the stupid old man." The want of intelligence that has induced the negroes to give it that name is shown by its carrying away fruits and sugar-canes separately, instead of tying them together and carrying several off at the same time. The peculiarity enables the negro to lie in wait to shoot the animal—a very dangerous sport, for should he miss, or only maim the animal, the negro is quickly overtaken and killed, or dreadfully mangled by the large canine teeth of the creature. Sometimes when a negro is passing unawares under a tree in which a gorilla is seated, it will reach down its arm and snatch the man up by the throat and hold him till he is strangled. The elephant is an object of its attack, as they both live on the same food, and, holding on to a high branch with its hind feet, it will stoop down and strike the elephant with a club. The gorilla is sometimes seen walking erect, with its arms behind its neck; its usual mode of progression, however, is on all-fours.

9. **SHOWER OF FISH.**—If any one has entertained doubts as to the possibility of this phenomenon, his hesitation will be put to rest by a well-certified occurrence at Mountain Ash, Glamorganshire. At 11 A.M. of the 9th of February, during a heavy rain, a stiff gale blowing from the south, a very large number of small fish were precipitated upon the fields and housetops at that place. The phenomenon was witnessed by a great number of persons: the Rev. Mr. Roberts, curate of St. Peter's, Carmarthen,

and the Rev. John Griffith, the Vicar of Aberdare and Rural Dean, made inquiries on the spot, in order to preserve the facts of this curious occurrence. The following is the testimony of John Lewis, a sawyer, who was the principal witness:—

"On Wednesday, February 9, I was getting out a piece of timber, for the purpose of setting it for the saw, when I was startled by something falling all over me—down my neck, on my head, and on my back. On putting my hand down my neck I was surprised to find they were little fish. By this time I saw the whole ground covered with them. I took off my hat, the brim of which was full of them. They were jumping all about. They covered the ground in a long strip of about 80 yards by 12, as we measured afterwards. That shed (pointing to a very large workshop) was covered with them, and the shoots were quite full of them. My mates and I might have gathered bucketsful of them, scraping with our hands. We did gather a great many, about a bucketful, and threw them into the rain-pool, where some of them now are. There were two showers, with an interval of about ten minutes, and each shower lasted about two minutes or thereabouts. The time was 11 A.M. The morning up-train to Aberdare was just then passing. It was not blowing very hard, but uncommon wet; just about the same wind as there is to-day (blowing rather stiff), and it came from this quarter (pointing to the S. of W.). They came down with the rain in 'a body like.'"

Mr. Griffith collected 18 or 20

living specimens of the unexpected visitants and transmitted them to Professor Owen. The three largest were four inches long. Some, which died after capture, were fully five inches in length.

11. COLLISION AT SEA.—*Loss of five Lives.*—Between 12 and 1 o'clock in the morning, a collision took place about 13 miles from Fleetwood, between the steamer *Prince Patrick* and the schooner *Elgin*, from the effects of which the latter immediately sunk, and there perished with her, the captain, his wife, and child, and two seamen. Four seamen were saved. At the moment of collision the steamer was going at the rate of ten miles an hour, the schooner about eight. The effect of two large bodies meeting at such speeds was necessarily that the smaller should be crushed, and as the schooner was laden with pig iron she went down immediately. The four seamen saved themselves by scrambling on board the steamer, while the vessels were yet in contact. A boat was immediately launched to pick up the other persons on board, but nothing could be seen of them. The *Prince Patrick* was considerably damaged, but being divided into water-tight compartments was able to put back to Fleetwood without much difficulty.

12. FIRE AND LOSS OF LIFE IN WHITECHAPEL.—At 5.30 A.M. a fire broke out in the premises of Mr. Walton, grocer, 57, High Street, Whitechapel, which destroyed the house and contents to a considerable value, and by which two females lost their lives. Six other persons were on the upper floors, and, being cut off from escape by the flames, would

have perished but for the brave exertions of an escape-conductor, named Wood. The exertions and success of the fire-escape men in the numerous fires that occurred about this time were very remarkable. At one fire, which broke out in Leather Lane, no fewer than 25 persons owed their lives to the activity and courage of conductor Askell.

16. TELEGRAM FROM INDIA.—(*Received at the India Office, Feb. 16, at 8.30 P.M.*)—"Tranquillity continues to prevail in Oude. Those of the rebels who have not come in under the amnesty have either dispersed and gone to their homes, or have fled into the Terai. One body of them under Bala Sam is reported to have entered the Nepal forests. It is known that the Nawab of Furruckabad has surrendered himself.

"CENTRAL INDIA AND RAJPOOTANA.

"Colonel Benson marched 140 miles in five days, attacked Tantia Topee's force, and defeated it with much slaughter, taking six elephants. Tantia was also attacked and defeated by the force under Colonel Somerset at Chuppra and again at Burrod, in the Kotah territory. Later intelligence showed that the rebels were moving in the direction of Tonk and Sewpore, and Brigadier Showers, with a column from Agra, after marching 94 miles in three days, came up with them at Dewsha on the 16th inst., defeated, and dispersed them, killing about 300. The rebel leaders are said to have been Tantia, the Rao, and Feroze Shah."

(*Received at the Foreign Office at 12.45 P.M.*)

"Alexandria, Feb. 11.

"The steamer *Northern*, from

Bombay, arrived at Suez on the 8th inst., Bombay date January 25.

"The rebellion in Oude is entirely suppressed. The Begum and some followers have gone by night-marches into Nepaul, partly foreign (forcing?) her way, partly bribing; the sepoys of her party said to be plundering the Nepaul villages.

"A corps of observation remains on the frontier.

"The Nana supposed to be with the Begum.

"Brigadier Showers, with a column from Agra, came up with the rebels under Tantia Topee, at Boshah, on the 16th of January, having marched 94 miles in three days. They defeated and dispersed them, killing about 300. Three chiefs fell on the field, and one, on an elephant, was overtaken and killed by Lieutenant Hadfield, of the Agra Police Cavalry.

"On the same day a body of rebels crossed the River Sarlah into Rohilcund, but were driven back."

"The following is the latest intelligence from Allahabad:—

"January 18, 7.23 P.M.

"The Commissioner of Rohilcund reports that the rebels, who numbered from 20,000 to 30,000, were defeated with slaughter, and driven across the Sartheas, their guns taken, and Nurput Singh of Rooza and Benec Singh killed.

"There has been a disturbance in the Nizam's territory, and parties of marauders, composed of Rohilla Arabs and Deccanees, are doing much mischief (on?) the borders of Berar.

"The Duraty Commissioner,

while at Rissade on the 15th of January, was attacked. Brigadier Hill Howard came to his assistance. Some fighting ensued, and in the pursuit of the enemy several casualties occurred among our officers.

"JOHN GREEN."

22. DREADFUL STEAM-BOAT EXPLOSION AT CARDIFF.—*Nine Lives lost.*—The outer lock of the Eastern Bute Docks at Cardiff, was the scene of a dreadful disaster. About half-past 10 the steam tug *Black Eagle* had arrived from London. The steamer came up with her colours flying, &c. One of her owners, Mr. Elliott, and Mr. Jenkins, an agent, were on board, for the purpose of witnessing her first performance; which was to tow a vessel out of the dock. The steamer was blowing off at a very high pressure, and in order to hear the instructions of the captain the man at the engine placed his hand on the safety-valve to keep it down. Immediately afterwards the steamer blew up, and immense pieces of timbers, and four persons were instantly killed. They were terribly mangled by the force of the explosion. The body of one was blown upwards of 60 yards from the boat. The body of Mr. Jenkins must have been blown into the water, for it could not be found. Another of the crew died in the Infirmary. The engineer died of his wounds a fortnight afterwards. Mr. Elliott lost one eye. Nor was the mischief confined to the persons on board the vessel. A considerable number of spectators lined the quay. The fragments burst among these like grape-shot. Seven were so severely injured that they were taken to the In-

firmary, and of these three died ; nine lives were therefore lost by this calamity.

26. FATAL FIRES IN MARYLEBONE.—*Six Lives lost.*—A fire, unusually fatal to life, occurred in Marylebone, late on Friday night or very early on Saturday morning. A constable observed that the shop of one Reeves, an eating-house keeper, in Great James' Street, Marylebone, was on fire. He raised an alarm, and sent for the fire-escape. Thenoisebrought Reeves, his wife, their children, and two servants, to the windows. Their position was perilous in the extreme. The fire was rushing up the staircase, and the smoke eddying round the room. Some one brought a ladder. It was too short, but, aided by Mr. Reeves, his cook got her feet on the upper round, and descended in safety. Two fire-escapes now arrived, under the charge of Hall and Horne. By these means two of the children were immediately got down in safety, and constable Hobbs had gone up, and had secured Mrs. Reeves and one of the children, when some person broke open the street door, thereby at once giving vent to the air, which drove the flames with tremendous force through the shop shutters and first-floor windows. The result was to set fire to the escape on which the poor fellow Hobbs was, with Mrs. Reeves and one of her children in his arms, burning him so that he was forced to let go his hold, and he fell with his burden to the ground with a frightful crash. The poor fellow was picked up almost insensible, and on raising him it was found that the thigh of one leg and the ankle of the other were broken. The child was so

VOL. CI.

much injured that it died soon after being taken to the hospital. Some of Mr. Reeves's children had already disappeared from the windows, no doubt from the effects of suffocation, when escape-inspector Horne, finding it impossible to plant his escape in front of the now blazing building without its sharing the same fate as that belonging to his brother officer Hall, placed it against the adjoining house, and, having unshipped his short ladder, reached the roof, in the hope of being enabled thus to rescue Mr. Reeves and the other persons still clinging in the deepest agony and suspense to the front of the window. He had just completed his preparations, when a loud and sudden crash was heard — the flooring had given way, and the unfortunate Mr. Reeves, four of his children, and his aged nurse, perished. The engines were somewhat late in arriving, but their exertions were effectual to confine the fire to the house in which it had broken out. When the ruins were sufficiently cooled to permit of search, the bodies of the five unfortunate persons were found in a frightfully-charred condition.

Another fatal fire occurred in the same district between three and four o'clock in the morning of Sunday, the 6th March. The building was a tavern, the Great Portland Wine and Spirit Stores, or Horse and Groom Tavern, kept by Mr. John Price in Great Portland Street. There were in the house eight adults and two children. As the staircase was in flames when the discovery of the fire was made, that retreat was cut off. Mitcheleno, a fire-escape conductor, who acted with heroic

courage, rescued Mr. and Mrs. Price and their children. He had ascended again when the fire burst through the windows of the second floor, and he had to fly down the machine for his life. One man jumped from an upper window; two others were pulled through the ground-floor window. All were more or less seriously hurt. Flames were now bursting through all the windows with such fury that no further attempts at rescue could be made:—probably, indeed, these unfortunates had by this time perished. As soon as the flames had been subdued, and the ruins sufficiently cooled, the firemen searched for the remains of these persons, and discovered, burnt almost to a cinder, the corpses of three persons, the pot-boy, the servant-girl, and a lodger.

• 26. ACCIDENT ON THE NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.—A serious accident occurred on the Rugby and Leamington branch of the North-Western Railway. The train which was due at Leamington at 10.35 A.M. had arrived at about a mile from that town, when, while running along a curve, a spring of the engine broke, and the engine, after running for some time, got off the rails and rushed down the embankment, 25 feet deep, dragging after it the tender and first-class carriage, which latter was rolled over and over. Beside the proper engine-driver and his stoker there were on the engine another driver and stoker, who were off duty. The two drivers were found under the engine crushed to death; one of the stokers died while being conveyed to the hospital; the other was dug out of the ruins seriously, but not mortally, injured. There were but few pas-

sengers in the train; of these four were injured, but not seriously.

26. LOSS OF H. M. GUN-BOAT JASEUR.—This gun-brig has been lost in the Gulf of Mexico, under the circumstances detailed in the following letter:—

“Santa Cruz, Cuba,
March 10, 1859.

“Sir,—As the mail is about to leave this place, I take the opportunity of acquainting you with the loss of Her Majesty’s gun-boat *Jaseur*, under my command. This event took place at 10.30 P.M. on the night of the 26th February, while on our way to Greytown from Port Royal, Jamaica, having been set by a strong current on the Rio Condor Reefs, and before morning the vessel proved a complete wreck. At 8 A.M. of the 27th we were compelled to abandon the ship with the boats and a raft we had made during the night, and from the circumstance of the ship filling so fast we were unable to obtain a sufficient supply of either provisions or water. I determined to make the best of my way to Port Royal, but, owing to the inclemency of the weather, we made no progress during the two following days.

“On the third day we had the misfortune to have one of the boats upset, by which accident ten lives were lost; during the day, the weather moderating, a consultation was held by myself and officers, when it was determined to take the men off the raft into the boats, parting company, each to make the best of his way to Jamaica, and on reaching this or being picked up by any ship, to send assistance to the other; but having no instruments or charts we were unable to de-

termine our position or make Jamaica; and after ten days' pulling and sailing to the northward found ourselves off the eastward head of the Doce Laguas Cayo, and were most kindly received by two Spanish fishermen, named Juan Oreigan and Peter Elmer-tegui, who supplied our immediate wants, and next morning piloted us to Santa Cruz, which we reached on the 9th of March, where we were most hospitably received by the captain of the port, Don Antonio Worgeochea, who immediately despatched a launch to search the cayes, in hopes of finding our missing boats.

"I am happy to say the officers and men in the boat with me (twenty in number) are beginning to recover from the effects of their severe sufferings during the ten days we were exposed in the boats, eight of which were passed without water. I cannot conclude without bringing before your notice the most generous and humane conduct of the fishermen above-mentioned; also of the authorities of this place. A despatch has been sent to the captain of the port of Trinidad, requesting a vessel might be sent to convey us to Jamaica.

"I have, &c.,

"T. B. SCOTT, Lieut., late commanding H. M.'s gunboat *Jaseur*.

"To the British Vice-Consul at Trinidad."

When the officer and men arrived in England a court-martial was held, and they were honourably acquitted. It was now supposed that as the crew of the *Jaseur* consisted of fifty-six officers and men, of whom only these twenty had appeared, that thirty-

six persons had perished. But soon after the court-martial, intelligence was received that a Spanish war-steamer had fallen in with the two missing boats and carried their crews to Jamaica.

26. ACCIDENT TO THE CALAIS PACKET.—In the old volumes of the ANNUAL REGISTER, of the days of sailing packets and hoys, there is frequent chronicle of the loss of the packet-boats between Dover and Calais, when numerous passengers—a large proportion men of rank and position—are recorded to have perished. Since the introduction of steam, the swift and powerful vessels employed on the service between these two ports, and between Folkestone and Boulogne, have acquired an almost intuitive knowledge of the course, and have reduced the trajet to a near certainty. When, therefore, an accident now occurs, it is a subject of interest for its novelty, as well of personal interest to the hundreds of thousands of English families who have habitually passed to and fro the Continent in safety and comfort. Such an accident occurred to the favourite packet-boat *Prince Frederick William*.

On the night of the 26th, the *Prince Frederick William* left Dover for Calais at about 11.40, the sky being dark and cloudy, the wind strong, W., changing to W.N.W., and the sea rough and heavy. There was nothing, however, in the state of the weather to occasion misgiving or alarm. In point of fact, the vessel made her passage in an hour and three-quarters, and was actually entering Calais harbour at about 1.25, when at that moment of apparent security an accident occurred. As the steamer moved slowly in

between the piers she found such shallow water (for the tide was at ebb) that she "tailed," or grounded, refused to answer her helm, and was presently carried by the cross set of the sea right against the eastern pier, to the serious damage of her port paddle-wheel. The engines were made immovable by the shock, and the tide, wind, and sea, acting together upon the helpless vessel, drove her out of the harbour and sent her ashore a little east of the pier. Here, with seven feet of water in her second compartment, she remained shifting about in the sand, but without danger, as the event proved, to passengers or crew, had it not been for a fresh scene in the tragedy.

A short time after the *Prince Frederick William* went ashore she sent off one of her quarter-boats, with her second mate, two hands, and six passengers, who were all landed "without wetting their feet." About two hours afterwards the Calais life-boat came off—a vessel which had been recently presented to that town by the English society—and made her appearance at the steamer's side. This, however, which might have been thought to insure safety, proved the cause of calamity; for after seven or eight passengers had got into her she capsized, and three of the number met a watery grave. The others either escaped to land (not above twenty yards off) or were taken on board the steamer again, where they encountered no further mishap, for at the next ebb they could all walk ashore without any difficulty whatever. The persons who thus unfortunately perished were Mr. Naeft, a Swiss merchant; M. Breuyere, of Ca-

nada; and Mr. Charles Davis, of Oxford Street. The official investigation resulted in proving that the commander of the packet was in nowise culpable for either of these unhappy events. The signals made from the pier and harbour were those which authorized him to enter in the usual manner, and the error of judgment rested with those on shore who signalled that authority. It would appear that there was a ground-swell for which they had not made a sufficient allowance. The accident to the life-boat is inexplicable. She was built upon the most approved principles that experience upon our coast had tested—she was supposed incapable of upsetting in the very roughest water, and that in the event of any extraordinary over-heaving she would instantly right herself. In this case she appears to have capsized under very ordinary circumstances, and without any adequate cause. It is probable that she was, in the first instance, lifted against the ship's side by a wave—that her gunwale caught under the ship's counter, and that a succeeding wave, aided by the stumbling and confusion of the passengers, threw her over and so pitched out the persons who had hastily rushed into her. The boat appears to have righted herself immediately.

The vessel was got off, and towed into Calais harbour without having received serious damage to her hull.

27. EXTRAORDINARY MURDER IN THE UNITED STATES.—The American journals are filled with details of a murder perpetrated at the legislative capital, which, from the social position of the

parties, and the extraordinary circumstances under which it took place, created great excitement throughout the length and breadth of the Union. The catastrophe also occupied much attention in this country, where two of the parties were well-known in the higher circles of London society; and the whole proceedings were a singular exposition of the state of society in the United States, of the moral feelings and sentiments of the community, and of their action upon the judicial tribunals of the country. The parties were the Hon. D. E. Sickles, a Member of Congress, and about 40 years of age; his wife, the daughter of M. Bagioli, a musician of high repute, whom he had married in 1853, by whom he had two children, and who was 22; and Mr. Philip Barton Key, United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, about 42. When Mr. Buchanan was the United States Minister, in London, Mr. Sickles was Secretary of Legation. He was accompanied by his wife, a child in years, and still more a child in appearance—for she was scarcely 16 when taken from school to be married. The unhappy lady was of singularly-interesting appearance, and attracted much attention in the circles in which she moved in London. When Mr. Buchanan quitted England, on being elected to the Presidency of the United States, Mr. Sickles also returned, and on the succeeding election he obtained the Democratic nomination for Congress from one of the metropolitan districts of New York. In due course he went to Washington, taking with him his wife. The

discharge of his duties had also brought to Washington Mr. Philip Burton Key, the nephew of the Chief Justice of the United States, and United States' Attorney for the district of Columbia, and thus an intimacy arose between him and Mrs. Sickles, which seems speedily to have assumed a criminal character. Whether it was that her husband became distasteful to her, or that he neglected her, or that Mr Key possessed attractions which extinguished in her mind all sentiments of her position, all feeling of duty, the young wife quickly became what she was not when she was known and admired here in London. Suspicion soon dogged the steps of the young wife and her paramour. As is usual in such cases, the husband was the last person to hear the history of his own dishonour. The connection between Mrs. Sickles and Mr. Key, it appears, began in April of last year, was continued through last winter, and renewed again at Washington during the present session of Congress. Impunity made them bold; they had not been discovered,—therefore they never would be discovered. Mr. Key hired a house, where they used to meet. A system of telegraph for the purposes of their guilty intercourse was arranged—when her husband was away from home Mr. Key would pass before the house, wave a handkerchief, and she would hurry out to meet him at their usual place of assignation; or when the lady desired to see her paramour, and the husband was out, a handkerchief was hung from the balcony which the seducer could see with his *lorgnette* from the club house,

which was opposite. Such an intrigue between such persons was not likely to be long concealed—the discovery arrived with accompaniments rather resembling the stern construction of a dramatic tragedy than the common tale of adultery and discovery.

On Friday, the 25th of February, Mr. Sickles was entertaining the President of the United States at dinner at his own house—he at one end of the table, and Mrs. Sickles at the other. The husband knew nothing—suspected nothing of the guilt and misery that were present at that social feast. In the midst of a dinner a letter was delivered to him which revealed to him the history of his wife's shame and of his own dishonour. At the time he could, of course, say nothing and do nothing. There sat his young wife opposite him, and by her side the President. When the guests went away he began to consider grimly with himself what course he should adopt. That night he appears to have said or done nothing; but the early part of the next day was spent in a careful investigation of the facts. When he had acquired a reasonable degree of certainty, Mr. Sickles taxed his wife with her guilt. She indignantly denied her crime; but the accurate description of the time, the place, the dress, and circumstances of the last assignation, forced conviction on the guilty woman that her shame was known. She screamed out that she was "betrayed and lost," and at length admitted the truth of the accusation. So far all was clear,—the question was how this grievous injury should be avenged? In the course of that

afternoon, while Mr. Sickles was considering with himself—frenzied with the sense of his wrong—what ought to be done, and was sitting at his window, he saw Mr. Key approaching his house, and making the appointed signal to the lady whom he had brought to this terrible grief. Unable to master his emotion the husband seized upon what weapons were near. These constituted a complete arsenal or armoury—we question if many English gentlemen could, in a moment of indignation, suddenly stretch out their hands, as Mr. Sickles did, and find ready two single-barrelled pistols and a revolver. Having placed these weapons in his pockets he sallied forth, and as Mr. Key was extending his hand for a friendly grasp Mr. Sickles exclaimed, "Now, villain, you must die!" and fired the first pistol at his enemy, but without effect. Mr. Key hurled an opera-glass in his face, and a death grapple commenced, the one man trying to master the other's arm, the other endeavouring to discharge his second pistol. Mr. Sickles prevailed, and with his second shot brought his enemy to the ground. So maddened with passion, however, was he that even when he had killed Mr. Key he discharged a barrel of his revolver into the dead man's head, and with an oath rendered himself up to the officers of justice. Such, amidst a vast mass of sickening detail, are the leading facts of this miserable story.

A terrible tragedy may well follow—has frequently followed—a similar guilt in England; but neither the feelings of the people, nor the regulations of police,

would permit the scenes that followed the committal of Mr. Sickles. The whole society of the city were ranged on the side of the murderer; they seem to have considered that he had done a brave and virtuous action. Men of the highest station hastened to bail him—his cell was perpetually filled with visitors—in short his imprisonment was one ovation. So entirely, indeed, was the public opinion on the side of the husband that the greatest difficulty was found in empannelling a jury which could pretend to even an appearance of judicial impartiality. The trial lasted from the 7th to the 24th, and resulted in a verdict of "Not Guilty"—probably the foregone conclusion from the beginning of the proceedings.

Deeply as it is to be lamented that judicial procedure should be thus abused, one still greater evil was probably avoided—that a criminal convicted of the most heinous crime commisable by man, should have escaped not only without punishment, but with applause; for, in the peculiar phase of public opinion, no sentence could possibly have been carried out. The verdict of *Not Guilty* was received with "a loud, thrilling, tumultuous huzza." The prisoner's counsel actually "returned thanks" to the jury. The late prisoner's passage through the jury-box was a triumph—the jury expressed a wish to congratulate him, and he stepped over the forms to meet them, and received and returned their compliments—one of his friends, Captain Wiley, *kissed him*. Outside the court he was received with tremendous cheers, and the mob attempted to take out the horses from his carriage and draw him

home. The populace serenaded his counsel, and then the jury. Probably could these feelings be analyzed there would be found a basis of honest though illogical feeling. No doubt the purity of domestic life had been foully outraged; but the populace forgot that in their zeal for the seventh commandment they were applauding a breach of the sixth—and that a terrible violation—for Mr. Sickles had, under what he considered an intolerable provocation, sent an erring fellow-creature to his account. Without one feeling of mercy—without one moment's respite—he had violated the fundamental principle of civilized society, which has substituted the majesty of law for the frantic explosion of private vengeance. Society in America will have much to do before it can re-establish the calm course of justice, having deified revenge and homicide in the person of Mr. Sickles.

One other circumstance has to be narrated to complete the marvels of this extraordinary occurrence. But a few months had elapsed, when Mr. Sickles announced to the world, in a lengthy and inflated epistle, that he had again taken to his confidence and protection the guilty woman who had been the occasion of so terrible a crime, and such public shame.

28. WHOLESALE SHEEP POISONING.—A very curious case, *Black v. Elliott*, has been tried at Newcastle, brought by a farmer, to recover the value of 850 sheep, poisoned by a sheep-wash sold by the defendant.

It appeared that the lotion is in very extensive use among sheep farmers; that the plaintiff had

purchased a sufficient quantity to wash a large number of his flocks; and that after being so washed a large proportion became dangerously affected, and 850 died. The lotion contained a great proportion of arsenic, and it was alleged for the defendant, that after it had been applied, there ensued very heavy rains, which washed the solution from the fleeces on to the grass of the meadows in which the sheep were pastured; and that they had died from the effects of eating the grass so poisoned. The mischief had arisen from the hasty manner in which the operation of washing had been conducted; that 7800 sheep had been dipped in 12 hours, whereby no sufficient time had been allowed for the squeezing or drying of the fleeces; so that an unusual quantity of the poisoned lotion had dropped upon the grass.

The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff; damages, 1,400*l*.

SALE OF THE HERTZ COLLECTION.—The present year has been remarkable for the dispersion of two almost unequalled collections of works of art—the Hertz collection of gems, cameos, and intaglios, ivories, works in glass, ceramic ware, bronzes, etc., relics of Etruscan, Greek, Roman, Assyrian, Indian, Chinese, and other national art; and Lord Northwick's noble gallery of paintings of every school.

The Hertz collection, sold by Messrs. Sotheby, was divided into 3117 lots, and the sale occupied sixteen days. It is not possible to do more than select a few of the most striking examples. *Statuettes*—a young Mars, 59*l*.; a Greek statuette of Greek art, 13½ inches high, 125*l*. *Vases*—

an amphora, Achilles dragging the body of Hector, 87*l*.; intaglio, Medusa, 18*l*.; statuette, Mercury, in patina, 25*l*.; another, 12½ inches, 80*l*.; a votive head of priestess, bronze, 100*l*.; Tiberius, head bronze, with cloak of alabaster, 51*l*.; intaglio, Silenus and fawn, 21*l*.; a Bacchante, sardonyx, 31*l*.; female on couch, 63*l*.; Livia as Ceres, 41*l*.; Livia, in opaline, with portrait of Augustus in intaglio on the forehead, 175*l*. *Bronzes*—a lion, 85*l*. (for British Museum); metal mirror, from Chiusi, 34*l*. (do.); intaglio, Apollo, in nicolo, 90*l*. *Glass*—examples of figures let into the glass in outline in gold fillet—a vine-leaf on semi-opaque blue glass, set as ring, 12*l*.; a lizard, in the same, 88*l*. (Brit. Mus.); cinerary glass urn, from Carthage, 28*l*.; glass dish, richly embossed with figures filing the inner surface (rare in the extreme), 20*l*. 10*s*. Cameo, statuette in plasma, 2¼ inches, 34*l*. Set of vases, found at Cumæ (four lots), 200*l*.; cameo, a helmet, with Bellerophon and Pegasus on head-piece, chimæra on vizor, dog on neck-shield, 89*l*.; glass vase, resembling the Portland vase, 50*l*.; group of five Buddhist figures, 225*l*.

Besides these very remarkable examples, some of which commanded high prices by reason of their real beauty, some because of their extreme rarity, and others because they were wanted to complete collections, the lots in general were sold at a high rate. There were also a vast number of beautiful and valuable works of art, which enabled connoisseurs to commence or add to their cabinets for sums not extravagant. The total produce of the sale was 10,111*l*.

MARCH.

5. BAPTISM OF THE INFANT PRINCE AT BERLIN.—The Prussian *Gazette* announces the baptism of the infant son of the Prince and Princess Frederick William of Prussia, Her Majesty's grandson,

"To-day, at 1 o'clock, took place at Berlin, in the chapel of the Royal Palace, the baptism of the Prince born on the 27th of January, and son of his Royal Highness Prince Frederick William of Prussia. Dr. Strauss, principal Court Chaplain, assisted by several other clergymen, officiated. The young prince received the names of Frederick William Victor Albert. The following were present:—the Prince Regent of Prussia and the Princess of Prussia, the Prince and Princess Charles of Prussia, the Prince and Princess Frederick Charles of Prussia, the Princes Albrecht, father and son; Alexander Georges and Adalbert of Prussia; the Grand Duke of Saxe Weimar, the Duke of Saxe Coburg and Gotha, the Hereditary Grand Duke and Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and Prince Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. Singularly enough the *Gazette* proceeds to give a list of the *absent*. It commences with the King and Queen of Prussia, the Queen of Great Britain and the Prince Consort, and then follow the names of very illustrious persons, whom it is to be supposed were entitled by *etiquette* to receive invitations. After the baptism his Royal Highness the Prince Frederick William gave an entertainment.

"A letter from the Prussian capital gives us a few additional particulars. The Prince Regent, it appears, held the infant Prince at the baptismal font; and the young mother, the Princess Frederick William, was a witness of the ceremony from an apartment the doors of which open into the chapel. When the baptism was over, the Grand Mistress of the Household, Countess Perponcher, took the child to its mother, and all the company followed to present their congratulations to Her Royal Highness. The streets were dressed with flags and garlands, and at night the entire city was illuminated. Some of the streets presented a magnificent appearance. Among the public edifices remarkable for the splendour of the illuminations was the Hotel de Ville, which was lighted up by more than 50,000 jets of gas. At all the theatres a gala representation was given."

ESCAPE OF NEAPOLITAN EXILES.—For many years the fearful oppression exercised over political offenders by the Neapolitan Government, the cruelties, filth, and unspeakable tortures of their State prisons, have been a painful knowledge to the English people. The public services and private virtues of the Minister Baron Poerio, and the treachery, hatred and cruelty of his Sovereign, have been frequently dwelt upon. The work of Mr. Gladstone on the Neapolitan prisons had placed these horrible details before the world so vividly, that it was not possible to ignore them; and although it has become a political axiom that no Government has a right to interfere in the internal concerns of another na-

tion, yet the domestic oppressions of the Government of Naples were in themselves so shocking, and so fraught with danger to the peace of Europe, that the French and English Governments thought it their duty to remonstrate; and their representations meeting with no regard, suspended diplomatic relations with that wicked Court.

Suddenly the civilized world heard with astonishment and pleasure that many of the political prisoners had eluded the vengeance of their oppressors, and had found a secure asylum under the protection of the Queen of England. On the morning of the 7th of March an American merchant vessel put into Cork harbour, having on board Poerio and sixty-six of his fellow victims. The narrative of their arrival in this city of refuge is a singular tale of persistent malignity and romantic incident. It appears that the Neapolitan Government, abashed at the direct isolation in which she was placed by the two great civilized Powers of Europe, and it is believed influenced by the private advice of her patrons, Austria and Russia, had condescended to an *Act of Grace!* by which certain of these political prisoners were merely sent to perpetual banishment, and—a sentence beyond the power of any State—to transportation to America. Poerio and those fellow-prisoners to whom this grace was accorded, were placed on board the steamer *Stromboli*, which was towed by the war steamer *Ettore-Fieramosca* to the Bay of Cadiz. The prisoners demanded to be set ashore, and to be sent on board an Eng-

lish or French ship. They were told that the Spanish Government would not receive them, and that the other course could not be permitted. After a detention of twenty-five days, the oppressors made a bargain with an American captain that in consideration of dollars he would convey the captives to the United States; one-third of the sum being retained, to be paid when the ugly contract should be fulfilled. The name of this free citizen of the land of liberty *par excellence* is Samuel Prentice, of the ship *David Stewart*, of Baltimore. The captives were removed on board this ship. The prisoners then presented a protest to the captain and the American consul, invoking the protection of the laws of the United States, and demanding to be landed at an English port. On the 19th of February the *David Stewart* sailed from Cadiz, being towed 200 miles by the *Ettore-Fieramosca*. A prospect of liberty now broke upon the unhappy exiles. There were sixty-six in number, and, according to the popular narrative, manifested so determined a resolution not to be taken to any but an English port, that the captain, possibly sensible of his bad cause, succumbed to their resolution. It is further said that the exiles were not helpless on the open sea. The son of one of the prisoners, Settembrini, was serving as an officer in the English mercantile marine. Being a member of the Italian societies, he was made acquainted with the position of his father and his brothers in misfortune; he hastened to Cadiz in disguise, shipped himself on board the *David*

Stewart, and when that vessel had got well quit of the *Ettore-Fieramosca* threw off his disguise, and declared his determination to navigate the ship to a safe harbour; whereon the captain yielded, and made sail for Cork. This romantic incident may have some foundation; but the exiles themselves attribute the captain's compliance to his respect for their protest, and dread of the laws. It is admitted that he treated his passengers with courtesy and consideration.

The gentlemen who had thus reached a land where personal liberty is inviolable, were of such mixed grades of life as showed how indiscriminate had been the malignity of the Neapolitan Government. A Government might reasonably consider itself safer by the removal of a practised statesman, lawyers, and doctors; but it is difficult to say what danger they apprehended from the presence of a few chemists, apothecaries, artists, tailors, shoemakers, and journeymen, and these men of perfect insignificance in their ranks.

The joy of these unfortunate exiles on reaching a free land was expressed in the most lively manner; some even knelt and kissed the ground on which they first planted their feet as free men. It is unnecessary to say that the exiles were received with the warmest sympathy. A considerable sum was immediately raised, by means of which they were supplied with clothing and conveniences suitable to their rank. A further sum was subscribed to render permanent assistance, which was so dispensed by the committee as to further the plans for his future existence

that each might have formed. These gentlemen bore their exile with dignified resignation, and made no attempt to turn their misfortune into political capital.

18. THE QUEENBOROUGH MURDER.—At the Maidstone Assizes, Frederick Prentice was indicted for the murder of his sweetheart, Emma Coppins, a young girl only 15 years old.

The prisoner was a short, thick-set young man, with nothing forbidding or ferocious in his appearance. The prisoner was a labouring man, who had come to Queenborough about a twelvemonth before the fatal occurrence. Very little was known of him, but he was considered rather sullen and morose. The deceased was the daughter of a labouring man at Queenborough, a very good-looking girl, only 15 years old. She had for some time been employed as a servant at the Rose Inn, at Queenborough. The prisoner frequented that house, and paid great attention to the deceased, which caused his companions to joke him about her, but it did not appear that she in any way returned these attentions, but, on the contrary, always appeared to be afraid of him. A short time back the deceased left her service at the Rose, and went to live as a domestic servant with a person residing at Queenborough. The prisoner was continually watching her, and endeavouring to hold communication with her, but she always seemed desirous to avoid him. It appeared that the deceased went every evening about half-past eight o'clock to the Ship Inn at Queenborough to fetch beer for her mistress's supper, and on the evening of Tuesday

the 11th of January, she went out with a jug, as usual, to the Ship, where she was served with the beer, and then went away for the purpose of returning to her mistress's house. The unhappy girl was, however, destined never to reach it again alive; for in a very short time after she had left the public-house a violent scream was heard, and upon some persons going to the spot the deceased was found lying in the road, with her throat cut in a frightful manner, and quite dead, with an open razor covered with blood, and a cap, both which articles subsequently turned out to belong to the prisoner, lying by her side. The prisoner was immediately suspected to be the murderer, and an officer who went in pursuit discovered him wandering about in a lonely road, about three miles from Queenborough, without a cap, and a handkerchief with a knot tied at each corner upon his head, and his clothes and hands covered with blood. The moment he saw the officer the prisoner went up to him and said, "I am your prisoner; my name is Prentice." He trembled violently, and appeared dreadfully agitated, and shortly after he had been secured he inquired of the officer whether "she" was dead; and when he was told that she was, he exclaimed that he wished some one would kill him. The prisoner never attempted to deny his guilt, and while in prison repeatedly expressed his intention of pleading guilty. This resolution he steadfastly carried out on the present occasion. When the clerk of assize, having read over his indictment, asked him, in the usual form, whether he was

guilty or not guilty, he replied in a firm calm voice, "I am guilty." Baron Martin explained his position to him, adding that if he pleaded guilty to or was convicted of this crime he would certainly be executed. The prisoner again said, "I am guilty, my lord." To a further explanation he replied, "I cannot speak against my conscience. I cannot plead otherwise." His lordship having then asked him in the usual form whether he had anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon him (to which the prisoner made no reply), passed sentence in very feeling terms, and the prisoner was removed without having evinced the slightest emotion. He maintained this resolute demeanour even on the scaffold.

19. TERRIBLE RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN AMERICA.—A singular and terrible accident has occurred on the Great Western Railway of Canada between Hamborough and Dundas. At the fatal spot, the railway crosses a deep ravine on a roadway or embankment formed of large stones or rocks, filled up with sand and earth. The rains had been unusually heavy, and a large body of water rushed down this ravine until stopped by the embankment. This it gradually undermined, carrying away the loose material, and the more solid portion collapsed, and so formed a chasm 100 yards in length and 50 feet deep.

When the night express arrived at this point it was quite dark, and no sign was afforded of the pit-fall to which the train hurried on its way. In an instant the engine and tender leaped into the

abyss, closely followed by the baggage car, an emigrant car, two first-class passenger cars, and a sleeping car. It is wonderful that any of the passengers should have escaped with their lives. Enveloped in darkness, the snow falling fast, and the wind blowing furiously, in an instant men, women, and children were buried in the ruins of the train, the engine being underneath all, roaring terribly from its steam-pipes. The baggage-van went first, but the guard miraculously escaped. In the emigrant car, which was crushed to atoms, there were no passengers. The second-class passenger car was also totally destroyed, and seven of the unfortunate travellers killed; many others were so shockingly crushed and mangled that recovery was held impossible. The sleeping car and its inmates were more fortunate—it did not leap into the chasm, but rested with the fore part down the edge of the chasm and the hinder part on more solid ground. Its position, indeed, was so dangerous that the survivors did not dare to remain in it; and the whole miserable travellers sat among the killed and mangled with such shelter as could be hastily constructed of cushions and carpets through the remainder of that dreadful night.

Some time in June a frightful railway disaster occurred to a train from Chicago. A train of six cars was totally demolished, and over 70 passengers killed.

On the 27th of the same month, in consequence of an embankment crossing a ravine having been swept away by floods, a train of the Michigan Southern Railroad plunged into the chasm.

A great number of persons were drowned.

19. CONFLAGRATION OF A MERCHANT SHIP.—The Dutch bark *Equator* was entirely destroyed by fire in the river Mersey. She was bound to Batavia, and had a cargo of silk, cloth, and fine goods, valued at about 60,000/, nearly all of which was consumed. One man was killed by the mizenmast falling into his gig, which was alongside the vessel.

22. GREAT EARTHQUAKE IN QUITO.—Letters announce that on the morning of the 22nd of March a terrific earthquake visited the province of Leon and the city of Quito, and in seventy-four seconds reduced the city to ruins, crushing a considerable number of the inhabitants beneath their houses. As usual, from the nature of these phenomena, the most substantial edifices suffered most, those of slighter structure not being rent by the vibration. At Quito, the cathedral and churches, the government buildings and hospitals, are described as having their cupolas, towers, and pediments thrown down, and their walls rent. The accounts from the adjacent provinces represent the buildings of the town to have suffered in a similar manner.

25. WIFE MURDER AT RYE.—At the Lewes Assizes John White, 48, was charged with the wilful murder of his wife, Susannah White.

The prisoner, who when he was committed for trial in August last, was a strong hearty man, had suffered so much mental agony since he had been in confinement that his strength had been completely prostrated, and he was permitted to sit during the trial.

The prisoner several years ago married the deceased, who was a widow, and described as a remarkably handsome woman, she having at the time two children by her first marriage, and having borne six others to the prisoner. The prisoner was formerly in the service of Messrs. Lee, at Dover, but shortly before the occurrence in question had gone to Rye, where he was employed to superintend some works connected with the harbour. The prisoner and his wife lived very unhappily together; he was jealous of her, and they frequently quarrelled in consequence. The murder was alleged to have taken place on the 27th of July last year. It appeared that on the morning of that day the prisoner and his wife had a quarrel, and the deceased said that she would go to Mr. Druce, the foreman of the works at which the prisoner was employed, and get him to send her and her children back to Dover; and the prisoner in reply said that if she did so it would be the worst day's work she ever did. A few minutes after 11 o'clock the same morning, the deceased was seen going in the direction of the works, and the prisoner was observed going after her, and the wife was never again seen alive. On the following morning a boy, who was going to Rye, to fetch letters, saw some object floating in a ditch close to the town, but took no notice of it at the time; but seeing the same object on the following morning, he went to the spot, and saw it was the body of a woman, with one hand and part of the nose above the surface of the water. An alarm was raised, and upon the body being taken out it

proved to be that of the deceased, and upon a surgeon examining it, he ascertained that the immediate cause of death was suffocation; but there were also a number of slight cuts, apparently made by a knife, about the face and body, and the hands were also severely cut, apparently through having seized hold of the instrument while struggling with her murderer. There were marks of a violent struggle near the spot, and it was also evident that the murderer, whoever he was, had been into the ditch as well as the deceased, and footsteps were traced for a considerable distance in the direction of an old ruin called Camber Castle, a few miles from Rye. The prisoner was seen on the same day lying on the ground near the spot; his clothes were completely covered with mud, and it appeared that he was wandering about until the following Saturday, when he was taken into custody, in a nearly exhausted state, at a place called Rolvenden, in Kent. The prisoner at this time was still nearly covered with mud, and upon the constable telling him that he took him into custody for the wilful murder of his wife, he replied, "How do you know I murdered her? Did anybody see me do it?" The prisoner, in repeated expressions, admitted his guilt, and attributed the cause to an improper connection between his wife and a man named Barlow. The constable afterwards asked the prisoner where he had left his wife, and he said, "In the ditch close by the tramway leading to the works at Rye."

Other circumstances clearly proved that the prisoner was his wife's murderer. It appeared,

moreover, that while the prisoner was being conveyed to Lewes gaol, after his committal, he had a conversation with Johnson, an officer who accompanied him, respecting the murder, and in the course of it the prisoner said, "She agitated me; she agitated me to the last moment, and I took it all in good part; and if she had been persuaded by me and gone home it would not have happened. I told her to go home and mind the children, and she would not." The prisoner then said that after the affair had happened he went over several dikes, and fell head over heels into one of them, and if there had been a little more water in it he should not have got out again, and after this he exclaimed in a passionate manner, "Oh! if they would but forgive me, what would I not do for my children!"

The prisoner's counsel did not deny that the deceased had died by the prisoner's hand, but suggested that there might have been a struggle between them which had unintentionally a fatal result; and on that ground asked the jury to acquit him of the crime of wilful murder, and convict him of manslaughter only.

The jury were absent nearly two hours, and, upon their return, gave a verdict finding the prisoner *Guilty* of manslaughter only, to the manifest surprise of almost every one in court—the unhappy prisoner himself, who had evidently made up his mind for the worst, included.

Mr. Justice Wightman said, he himself could not imagine upon what portion of the evidence the jury had felt themselves justified in reducing the offence the prisoner had committed below

the crime of wilful murder, but they had found him guilty of manslaughter only, and he had no right to inquire into their reasons for coming to that conclusion. It was, however, clearly one of the worst cases of manslaughter that could be imagined, and he therefore felt it his duty to order him to be kept in penal servitude for the remainder of his life.

25. FATAL JEALOUSY, MURDER AND SUICIDE.—A terrible tragedy has occurred at Westbromwich. John Corbett, a miner, about 30 years of age, and his wife, Mary Ann, about 27, had been married about five years, and had two children. Corbett is described as a rather respectable man for his class, not indulging in drunkenness and vice quite to the extent of his comrades—a statement, considering the catastrophe now to be related, which suggests a shocking picture of the state of society in that district. The wife was an industrious woman, working as a tailor. This unhappy couple had long indulged in mutual feeling of jealousy and exasperation. The woman accused her husband of general drunkenness and incontinence, and asserted, as was but too true, that he constantly returned home drunken and inflamed, and abused and beat her in a terrible manner. They had more than once separated; but had as often come together again, the woman being induced to consent by fearful threats of revenge and murder from her husband. This savage at length admitted the demon of jealousy to possess his mind, and his fellow-workmen appear to have exasperated his feelings into frenzy by tales of his wife's

criminal connections—whether true or false does not appear, but probably false. With these passions he seems to have pursued his wife, who had taken refuge with her friends, with fearful intentions. On the evening of the catastrophe his fury had been newly aroused by the jibes of his acquaintances. On leaving work he appears to have calmed himself down to a settled purpose. He took his tea, and cleaned himself, and then, with some appearance of composure, he took his clasp-knife—a strong bladed weapon—and sharpened it upon a steel, replying to a question as to his object, that he did it to cut his thumb-nail which was broken. He then sallied out, and was overtaken by a neighbour who spoke to him about the tenancy of his house, which he had given notice to quit in consequence of his last separation from his wife. This inopportune conversation roused once more his fury, and having referred with frightful oaths to his wife's criminality, he exclaimed that he had been working in hell all day, and felt that he was going towards it still, and that every step brought him nearer. The refusal of his neighbour to believe the reports did not pacify him; he inquired where his wife worked, and went in the direction of her shop. The time having arrived for her passing that way to her lodgings, the husband lurked behind a wall to await her approach. Soon she passed the spot, leaning on the arm of a younger sister, who had gone to warn her that her husband was seeking her with an evident intention of ill-using her. As she drew near to the spot where the infuriated man lay in

ambush, he sprang out, put one arm round her, and with the other inflicted a deep gash in her throat. She cried, "Murder," and her head dropped upon her sister's shoulder. The sister unaware of the assault (for it was dark) led the poor woman to the other side of the road. The murderer followed, and lifting up his victim's head again cut her throat. It is probable that the deceased had raised her hand to defend herself from the first cut, for there was a deep gash in it, and one of the cuts on the throat was not deep; but the other was deep and long and effectually severed the carotid artery. The terror-stricken sister now perceived that blood was flowing copiously, and that not only their clothes but the pavement were covered with it. She shrieked "Murder," and at the cry the neighbours came with lights. The murderer was seen running away, saying, "I have done it," and shaking his hands. Being pursued he said he would give himself up to the police, and would not let others inform them of what he had done. Threatening to stop a messenger who was going to the police-station, the murderer pursued the man, knife in hand, but was outrun. The pursuit of the murderer was recommenced. When he was overtaken he was found upon his knees in the road, the fatal knife in his hand, now reeking with his own blood also. He had cut his own throat so effectually as to separate the windpipe and reach back to the spine. Blood had flowed into a pool around him. He was taken up and conveyed into the house of a man named Harris, his sister's hus-

band. He had inflicted a wound of which, after lingering to the 15th of April, he died. His victim was conveyed to her mother's house, where she died in half an hour.

28. RE-INTERMENT OF JOHN HUNTER.—The great anatomist, John Hunter, died on the 16th October, 1793. (See ANNUAL REGISTER, vol. 35). His death was sudden and melancholy. Two young men had come from Scotland to enter on their studies at St. George's Hospital, ignorant of some regulations about to be enforced against students similarly circumstanced as the gentlemen in question. Hunter informed them of the law which had been passed, but undertook to press for their admission at the next board day. On the 16th October, 1793, the meeting took place, and Hunter prepared to fulfil his promise, though he was so well aware of the risk he incurred in undertaking a task which he felt would agitate him, that in mentioning the circumstance to a friend, who called on him in the morning, he expressed his apprehension lest some unpleasant dispute might occur, and his conviction that if it did, it would certainly prove fatal to him. On arriving at the hospital he found the Board already assembled, and, entering the room, presented the memorial of the young men, and proceeded to urge the propriety of their being admitted. In the course of his remarks he made some observation which one of his colleagues thought it necessary instantly and flatly to contradict. Hunter immediately ceased speaking, retired from the table, and, struggling to suppress the tumult of his passion, hur-

VOL. CL.

ried into the adjoining room, which he had scarcely reached, when, with a deep groan, he fell lifeless into the arms of Dr. Robertson, one of the physicians of the hospital. Various attempts were made for upwards of an hour to restore animation, under the hope that the attack might prove to be a fainting-fit; but in vain; life had fled, and, all efforts proving useless, his body was conveyed in a sedan chair, followed by his now empty carriage, to Leicester-square. The body was privately interred in the church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, where it quietly reposed until the recent Order in Council requiring the vaults to be closed up gave Mr. Frank Buckland, a member of the College, an opportunity of searching for the precious remains, which were found enclosed in what must originally have been a very handsome coffin, covered with fine black cloth, and thickly studded with gilt nails and ornaments. On it was a brass plate with the family arms, encircled in a rich scroll, with the cypress entwined, and bearing the following inscription:—"John Hunter, Esq., died 16th October, 1793, aged 64 years." The Royal College of Surgeons took the necessary steps that the remains of its illustrious member should finally repose in the receptacle of England's most honoured dead—Westminster Abbey. The body was accordingly, this afternoon, re-interred on the north side of the nave, between Wilkie and Ben Jonson. No portion of the service appointed for the dead was read over the grave. The body, in its original coffin, had been placed within the Abbey, and was now carried on a bier to the

D

grave, followed by a procession, consisting of the Dean of Westminster, the Presidents of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and officers of those Societies; the Master and Wardens of the Apothecaries' Company, the Presidents of the Linnæan, Medical and Chirurgical, and Medical Societies; distinguished Professors of the London hospitals, and many metropolitan and provincial surgeons. The coffin was reverently placed in the grave without any ceremonial. It has been proposed to erect a statue to Hunter's memory, and upwards of 600*l.* have been subscribed.

29. CHILD MURDER.—At the Kingston Assizes, Mary Jones, 19, a good-looking young girl, was charged with the wilful murder of her female illegitimate child by cutting its throat.

No counsel was engaged either for the prosecution or the defence. The prisoner was in an almost fainting state during the trial, and appeared to be hardly conscious of what was going on.

It appeared that the prisoner was an unmarried woman, and that she lived in the house of a person named Ede, at Hambledon, near Godalming. She had been seduced, and was in the family-way. About the month of August last the people about her suspected that she was in that condition, but the prisoner always denied the fact. On the 27th of August she was taken very ill, and a neighbour made some mint tea for her, and upon going into her bedroom she at once suspected that she had been delivered of a child. Blood was seen to be issuing from a box that stood near the prisoner's bedside, and a knife covered with blood was

lying on the floor. Upon the box being opened, the dead body of a full-grown female child was discovered, with the throat cut, and everything in the box was completely saturated with blood. A surgeon who was called in, upon examining the body, ascertained that the wound in the throat had been inflicted from the right to the left hand, and it was of such a severe character that death must, in his opinion, have been instantaneous; and he expressed himself confidently that the infant was born alive, and that the death was the consequence of the wound. The prisoner subsequently admitted that the child was hers, and said that she had used a knife to divide the umbilical cord, and that she put the child into the box because she did not know what else to do with it.

The prisoner, in her defence, sobbed out a few unconnected words to the effect that she was in such agony at the time that she did not know what she was about.

The jury, after a short deliberation, found the prisoner guilty of wilful murder, but at the same time strongly recommended her to mercy.

The JUDGE then passed sentence of death on the unhappy creature, who was carried out of court insensible. The sentence was commuted.

29. CANNIBALISM IN THE SOUTH SEAS.—An Australian paper gives the following dreadful narrative:—"A number of Chinese men, women, and children sailed from Hong-Kong for Sydney some few months ago. Their number is stated to be 327, and they shipped themselves as passengers. Their object, doubtless, was to reach

those gold-diggings where so many of their compatriots had realized a fair amount of profit for the labour they had bestowed. They proceeded fairly upon their journey until the 29th of September, when a squall arose, and the vessel was eventually driven out of her course, and totally wrecked on the island of Rossel, in the South Pacific, about 500 miles from New Zealand, on the night of the 30th September last. The captain succeeded in landing his passengers on the island, and then left in his boat for the purpose of obtaining assistance. He was picked up at sea, on the 15th of October, and conveyed to the French settlement of New Caledonia. The authorities immediately despatched the French steamer *Styx* to ascertain the fate of the Chinese left on the island, and the vessel arrived there on the 8th of January last. Horrible to tell, it was found that the whole of the passengers and the remainder of the crew had been killed by the natives, with the exception of one Chinese, who, having been accidentally spared, was rescued by the crew of the steamer. The details of the massacre, which bear a horrid resemblance to the fate of Ulysses and his companions on the island of Polyphemus, were obtained from the Chinese. 'The captain left in his boat with some of the crew, and we were not disturbed by the natives for a month after he was gone; they then came over from the mainland, distant about three-quarters of a mile, and made an attack on us. Some of us had double-barrelled carbines, but we got frightened, and threw them away. The only white man left with us, after

the departure of Captain Pennard, was a Greek, who, having armed himself with a cutlass, fought desperately, and killed a great many of the natives before he was overpowered. They then took all our clothing, &c., which they partly destroyed. Any valuables that they found, such as sovereigns, rings, &c., they placed in a net bag, which each man carried round his neck. A watch particularly excited their attention, as they were continually opening it to observe the reflection of their faces in the glass. At night we were placed in the centre of a clear piece of ground, and fires lit in several places, the natives keeping a regular watch over us, and during the day they would select four or five Chinese, and, after killing them, roast the flesh, and eat it; what was not consumed being deposited in their nets. Their mode of proceeding was as follows:—The victims being decided on, they were taken out, and beaten all over (excepting the head) with a kind of club, and then despatched by ripping the stomach open. The body was then cut up in small pieces and divided, the fingers, toes, and brains being eagerly sought after; the bones were then collected, and either burnt or thrown away. I saw ten of my fellow passengers killed in this way. Every day they brought us cocoanuts or some wild roots to eat, and appeared to be quite friendly with us. This state of things continued until I was taken off the island. When I left there were only four Chinese and the Greek alive, all the rest having been killed. I saw these five the day the steamer came in sight; but when the natives saw the boats

coming on shore they took them to the mountains."

The inhabitants of the Feejee Islands thought proper to kill, cook, and eat two Americans, the surviving crew of a small vessel they had surprised. An American frigate was sent to punish the cannibals. These people took refuge in the mountains, and offered no opposition while their invaders destroyed their villages and a town of 115 houses. But as the Americans returned to their ship they were attacked in a ravine by a body of warriors, whom they repulsed with loss, but had themselves six men wounded.

30. EXPLOSION OF THE HOUNSLOW POWDER MILLS—*Seven Lives lost*.—The powder works of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, at Hounslow—celebrated alike for their excellence and their explosiveness—blew up at 10.30 A.M., and seven persons lost their lives.

The works occupy an area of more than 100 acres, and consist of numerous buildings, which are separated from each other by lofty and strong embankments and trees of huge growth—the intent being to prevent any fire or explosion spreading from one building to another, and to give the explosive force a vertical direction. By these precautions the destruction in this instance was limited to one press-house and one corning-mill, although the concussion was so great as to break the windows of houses three miles off, and the sound was heard at Cholesbury, 24 miles distant. In the immediate neighbourhood of the explosion the effects were terrific. Doors and windows shattered to pieces, outhouses unroofed, pieces of charred timber, bricks, branches

of trees, and fragments of machinery littering the ground in all directions. The branches of the trees were swept away, and their trunks stood naked and charred, in some directions broken into stumps. Where the explosion originated—the press-house—no building remained; nothing but a blackened hole in the ground. The lofty and thick embankment which surrounded these buildings was levelled to the ground on one side, and its ruins choked up the water-course, thirty-feet wide, which supplied the works.

The unfortunate men who perished were employed in the corning-house. They were so dreadfully shattered that only one could be recognised, and he was at a short distance from the building when the explosion took place. The others were blown to fragments—torn limb from limb, and scattered in all directions. The limbs and trunks were gathered into a promiscuous heap, to await a coroner's inquest.

Since all the persons who were in the buildings at the time of the accident perished, the immediate cause of the catastrophe remained unknown. There was no unusual quantity of powder in the house, nor was there any particularly dangerous process in hand. It was the opinion of the best authorities that the origin and the direful effects of the explosion were in the use of the hydraulic presses, which were capable of containing 15 cwt. of "treble dust" each. The explosion is supposed to have taken place in one of those, under an enormous pressure. This pressure necessarily infers strong enclosure, which, as is well

known, has so material an effect in increasing the explosive force of gunpowder.

In May another accident occurred in these mills; the four "incorporating mills" blew up with a series of tremendous explosions, and all four were destroyed. One man was mortally or severely injured. As this accident occurred at 11 o'clock at night, no suggestion can be made as to the cause.

DREADFUL POACHING MURDERS.—The Spring Assizes have been lamentably distinguished by trials for murders and murderous assaults arising out of poaching affrays.

At Nottingham, Thomas Brown Birkett was indicted for the murder of William Watmore. Birkett was a small farmer in a game district. He shot on his own land, and was on bad terms with his neighbours. He had lost some traps, and suspected keepers of having taken them away. One night in November he saw Watmore and one Vesey in the adjoining fields. In his evidence, Vesey said that on seeing them Birkett called loudly, "Where are those traps marked with 'H. G.' that belong to me?" Watmore answered shouting, "We haven't any; I don't know anything about them." The prisoner replied, "You're a ——— liar and a ——— thief!" Watmore called him a "bucket-head," several times. "I said he was a 'chuffy face' several times. We were still at the distance named. The prisoner said, 'If you'll come here I'll rightle you' (a term which the witness could not interpret). Watmore said to me, 'We'll go, and he shall have the chance!'" After

some altercation at the gate, the parties being on opposite sides, Birkett shot Watmore dead. Birkett said Watmore was about to strike him, and that he fired in self-defence. Words, however, were reported, showing that Birkett harboured evil designs against Watmore. The jury found him guilty, but recommended him to mercy, on the ground that he had received great provocation from the keepers. Sentence of death was passed, but was not carried out.

Another case was tried at York, which produced some valuable remarks from the presiding Judge.

Seven young men were tried for the murder of John Washington Jex, gamekeeper, at Bishop Burton, in Yorkshire. Jex was 60 years old, but brave and determined. On the 16th of November he went out to watch with Geddes, underkeeper, and Robinson, watcher. Jex and Geddes each carried a double-barrelled gun, and a double-barrelled pistol. Robinson had a heavy bludgeon. They caught the poachers *flagrante delicto*. An affray began by a shot from Jex, which killed a dog. Then followed a *melée*; shots were exchanged; Geddes was hit in the leg; Jex was knocked down; Robinson beaten and put to flight. The wrath of the poachers was concentrated upon Jex, and they literally beat him to death. Two of the poachers were badly wounded. The defence was that the poachers had acted in self-defence. Mr. Justice Byles said it was to be regretted that gentlemen, for the sake of protecting their amusement, permitted their servants to go out heavily armed, as the

gamekeepers in this case had been. He did not think the game laws had anything to do with the matter. Gentlemen would protect the game on their lands, and young men would go out to defy, or to elude the watchers. In the present case one of the watchers had been left dead on the field of battle, as he might call it, the other two had been badly wounded; several of the poachers' party had been severely wounded, and one was said to have died of his wounds. This had resulted from the watchers being permitted to go out so heavily armed for the protection of hares and pheasants. He said it deliberately, and he felt it his duty to say it, that great blame attached to both parties in bringing about this lamentable result. If the keepers, having a right to apprehend the poachers assembled to the number of three or more armed, on the lands of their master, to take game, did no more than endeavour to apprehend them, which they lawfully might do, then the killing of the head keeper was murder, and all present aiding, abetting, and assisting in that act were guilty of murder. But if the keepers used more violence than was necessary in endeavouring to apprehend the poachers, and the death of one of the keepers resulted from the resistance of that violence by the poachers, then the killing was manslaughter, and not murder. Three of the men were acquitted; and four others, found guilty, were sentenced one to eight, two to five, and one to three years' penal servitude.

At Lancaster, three men were tried for the murder of James

Eatough, at Whalley, on the 13th December last. The deceased was a watcher, employed by Mr. Whalley, and on the night of his death went on to his grounds, accompanied by his son, four other watchers, and a police-constable. They came upon several men engaged in netting. None of the watchers had guns; some of the poachers had, but with the exception that one snapped his piece at a keeper, they do not appear to have used them. A desperate conflict with sticks ensued, in which the watchers got by far the worst. Eatough was so dreadfully beaten, his skull being fractured, that he died soon after; another had two ribs broken, the others were all more or less injured. Nor did the poachers leave the field of battle uninjured.

Mr. Justice Willes said that, without entering into the question whether the game-laws were politic or not, it was clear that the laws of no civilized country would permit bands of armed men to trespass on the grounds of another man to take by violence what was his property; and if in so doing they killed any person who had the right of resistance, they were clearly all guilty of murder. But if in this case they thought that the keepers, by their conduct and excess of violence in attempting to arrest the men, had provoked the blows in hot blood, which led to the death of the deceased, then the offence was only manslaughter.

The jury took this view, and found two of the prisoners guilty of manslaughter—one of whom was sentenced to ten, and the other to four years' penal servitude.

At Liverpool, another of this gang, who had absconded, was

tried for the same offence, convicted, and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude.

At other assize towns, other poachers were tried for night poaching, and firing at, and assaulting the keepers. Most were convicted, and sentenced to various terms of penal servitude.

THE DODDINGTON MURDER.—At Chester, a much more terrible case was tried.

Richard Bolton and John Danks were indicted for the wilful murder of Thomas Maddocks, on the night of the 28th November, 1858, at Doddington.

It appeared that on the night in question, Maddocks, Beach, and other keepers were watching a covert, when they heard two shots fired, and saw several men issue from the wood. The keepers, who had a dog with a chain with them, but were armed only with life-preservers and bludgeons, gave chase, overtook the poachers, and captured one or more. The others ran through the wood, but got caught in a pit, from which they could not get out. Finding the keepers close upon them, one of the men turned round and fired at Beach at about five yards' distance. The shot passed through the heart, and the unfortunate man fell dead. Almost immediately afterwards another of the poachers fired at Maddocks, at a very short distance. The shot tore his bowels on the right side; he fell mortally wounded, and died on the Monday following.

Several of the poachers were afterwards arrested by the police. There could be no doubt that all these persons were present on the occasion, but there was no independent evidence to identify the

persons who had fired the fatal shots. Three of the gang were admitted approvers, and made statements which, if they could be credited, put the guilt of the prisoners now at the bar beyond question. They were, however, most abandoned characters. One of them had passed his life, since he was fifteen, in a series of imprisonments, and was suspected of being an accomplice in the Copedale murder, "when the cutlasses were stuck through the heads of keepers," and had been charged with "murdering a policeman, but I never had anything to do with it."

The jury, after a long consultation, found a verdict of Guilty against both prisoners, and the Judge pronounced sentence of death, with feeling remarks, upon the terrible nature of the crime.

As his lordship came to the concluding words which pronounce the felon's doom, Danks fell forward senseless, with his face upon the front of the dock. Bolton exhibited great firmness throughout. Their sentences were not, however, carried out.

APRIL.

1. ACCIDENT TO A GOLD-SHIP.—The fine Australian clipper, *Indian Queen*, sailed from Melbourne for Liverpool, with a valuable cargo, 40 passengers, and 25,070 ounces of gold dust, on the 1st April, in lat. 60 S., long. 149 W.: while sailing twelve knots an hour she struck on an iceberg. The mainmast and foremast went over the side with a fearful crash, carrying away the bowsprit and figure-head. The captain, believing the ship would

speedily foundered, resolved to abandon her, and with the chief mate and thirteen of the crew, got into a boat. The second mate refused, and with the remainder of the crew, stuck by the ship. Their fortitude had its reward. The boat was capsized alongside, and all in her perished. The second mate navigated the ship, dilapidated as she was, into Valparaiso, on the 10th of June; saving thereby his own life, the lives of his men, and those of the passengers, a fine ship and cargo of immense value. His courage and perseverance were, it is reported, very munificently rewarded by his owners and the underwriters.

1. HORRIBLE CRUELTY AT SEA.
—At the Liverpool Assizes, a case of cruelty, almost without parallel, was tried.

James William Mitchell was indicted for aiding and abetting John Buchanan in the wilful murder of Thomas Lauder, a sailor, on board the *Bogota*.

The Attorney-General for the Duchy of Lancaster, said that the offence with which the prisoner stood charged was committed at five o'clock in the afternoon of the 25th of January last, on board the steamer *Bogota*, on the high seas. The cause of death charged was the confining Thomas Lauder, the deceased, in the stokehole of the steamer, whence he was removed in an exhausted, and, as it turned out, a dying state. The ship was a paddle-wheel steamer of about 650 tons burden, and had been employed as a mail steamer between Panama and Valparaiso. The deceased was a Cornish miner, and had saved, by mining in Chili, a little money, and

entered himself as stoker on board the *Bogota*, to work his passage home. The ship's crew consisted of 67, including four engineers (of whom Buchanan was the chief, and Mitchell the second), twelve firemen, and six stokers. The ship sailed from Valparaiso on the 27th of December, and arrived at Rio de Janeiro on the 23rd of January. During the cold weather in the Straits of Magellan the deceased was well up to his work; but in the hot weather he was so incapable that he offered money for an exchange of duty, and had intended to give up at Rio, but changed his mind. The ship sailed from Rio on the 25th of January shortly before 12 at noon. The deceased was in the prisoner's watch, which that afternoon was from 4 to 8. The ship had four boilers and two stokeholes. The deceased had already done some work in the stokehole when he came to his duty at 4. The day was hot and airless. The heat was so great that one at least of the crew knocked off from exhaustion. The deceased came out of the stokehole in consequence of the heat, and was ordered down by the prisoner. He came up again, but was pushed down by the prisoner into the after stokehole. He again, however, came up. During this time the two engineers were in the engine-room, and probably saw the deceased go up again. Mitchell then called to William Buchanan, one of the stokers, or trimmers, for some ropeyarn. He then went on deck and found the deceased complaining. Mitchell, then at the instance of Buchanan, the chief engineer, and with the help of another man, took Lauder, struggling and

crying, down the forward stoke-hole. He then tied him with the rope to the port or left rail of the ladder, at its foot, left him there alive, and went into the engine-room. The fore stokehole was 29ft. 11in. long, 6ft. 10in. wide, and 16ft. high. There was a narrow passage about two feet wide, which led from the stoke-hole between the boilers into the engine-room, which was much cooler than the stokehole. And up and down the engine-room the prisoner walked, watching the deceased, who cried for help, first on men and then on God, till he sank. He was tied up about half-an-hour, during which time the furnaces were fired up twice. There were six furnaces, and the ladder came to within 3 feet of the nearest furnace. The deceased, about the time of the second firing up, swung round with his head hanging towards the nearest furnace. The fireman who had fired up the furnaces then went and said to the prisoner, "Tom is dead." The prisoner then went up and returned with the chief engineer and doctor. The deceased was carried up gasping. The doctor ordered his head to be bathed, but respiration became feebler, and at last ceased. At Liverpool, on the arrival of the ship, some of the crew gave information of what had happened. Both engineers were arrested, and the prisoner said he had acted by the orders of the chief engineer. There was, however, some evidence that the prisoner had originated the idea of tying the prisoner down. He had threatened to chain him down, and had provided ropes. He walked up and down within sight and hearing of the deceased,

but took no steps to relieve him till told "Tom is dead."

Such was the very mild statement for the prosecution—the plain-spoken fact is, that the crime of the prisoner was that he had roasted the poor stoker alive. The chief engineer, Buchanan, and the prisoner, had both been committed for trial; but, with a remarkable leniency in such a case, the magistrate admitted them to bail. Buchanan, in consequence, did not surrender, but fled the country. The evidence was very lengthy, and the best way to give an idea of the horrible cruelty perpetrated, is to give a few detached extracts.

A fellow stoker described the deceased as 40 years of age, 5ft. 6in. high, and stout built. Owing to the heat of the weather the deceased was unable to continue his work in the ash-pit. Saw Mitchell push deceased down the ladder from the deck; he called for a rope, and made the deceased fast by the arms and body to the ladder. The place where he was tied was about 36 inches from the mouth of the nearest furnace. In firing they opened the doors of the furnace, and that very much increased the heat. The head and left side of the deceased would be 15 to 18 inches from the open furnace. A few minutes after the firing was got up he heard the deceased begin to pray to his Maker to take him away from that place, and to relieve him. His cries grew louder the longer he stood—loud enough to be heard in the engine-room. When Wilson had got up the second firing he saw deceased yield to the heat; his strength had given way, and he fell, supported by the rope. He

ceased to cry when he fell over, and he never heard him utter a word more. Before that he had prayed at intervals. Witness and Wilson had given evidence against the chief engineer. He had been in public houses and had seen a picture of a roasting sailor, and he had been asked to tell the story of "the roasted sailor," but he did not think it was right.

Wilson, a stoker, corroborated this evidence, and said that when he opened the furnace door, deceased cried out, "Oh Lord, have mercy upon me!—Oh God, have mercy upon me!" several times. Witness went on deck. When he returned, he found the deceased tied up. He was swinging by the rope without any power, and his feet in the ashes in the way of the furnace fire. He had to move the deceased to fire up.

The surgeon of the vessel described the condition of deceased when he was called to attend him on being removed from the stoke-hole. This person described the heat as not at all excessive, and was astonished that it should have overpowered the deceased; but he admitted that the furnace doors were not opened while he was there. He was certainly of opinion that the confinement and treatment he had received in the stokehole was calculated to bring on apoplexy. Deceased died of an attack of what is commonly called "fulminating apoplexy"—that is, a very rapid form of apoplexy.

The evidence of these persons was repeated in various forms by other engine-room men and sailors; who agreed generally in describing the cruelty as being perpetrated under the authority of the chief engineer, Buchanan. What is, perhaps, the most extra-

ordinary part of the tale is, that all this torture was inflicted under the knowledge of the captain and sailing officers, and of passengers, without prevention or remonstrance; and that the feelings of the crew were repressed into secret discontent. Had the whole of the officers been brought within the arm of the law, it would have been no more than justice. The excuse of the captain was, that he had delegated his authority as respected the persons employed about the engines to the chief engineer; that these acts had been perpetrated without his authority, and without his knowledge.

The counsel for the prisoner, after denying that the death of deceased had been the result of any criminal act of his client, mainly rested his defence on the exigency of the naval service. "A ship," he said, "could not be worked unless there was perfect obedience and discipline on board it; and if the verdicts of juries were to be allowed to tamper with long-established customs, and the idea that the contracts of seamen were to be governed by the new-fangled notions of what obedience was due, the days of the supremacy of this country on the sea were numbered."

Mr. Justice WILLES, after summing up the evidence, said, it had been argued by the learned counsel for the defence that such punishments were necessary for the proper discipline of the ship, and that without them the commercial marine would be destroyed; but there was nothing in the evidence to lead to that conclusion; and if inferior officers could be allowed to inflict such punishments without the au-

thority of the captain, every petty officer in the ship would exercise authority, and there would be no head. There was no power to interfere with the liberty of a man on board a ship, except by the direct command of the captain.

The jury found the prisoner *Guilty* of manslaughter; and the learned Judge, having commented on that "accursed system" of discipline said to exist on board our merchant ships and boldly defended, and which must be rooted out by the law, of each petty officer looking for orders to the officer above him only, sentenced the prisoner to 15 years' penal servitude.

6. DISASTROUS COLLIERY ACCIDENT.—*Twenty-six Lives lost.*—A terrible disaster occurred at the Mair Colliery, about 2 miles from Neath. It appears that these works have hitherto been worked by a single shaft, for both the "up-cast" and the "down-cast" draughts, and it had become a *desideratum* to open a new pit in order to form an up-cast shaft. On the morning of the disaster about 80 men and boys had descended the pit; some to proceed with the usual work of getting coal, others to form the new drift. While the borers were engaged in driving in a southerly direction they unfortunately struck into the workings of an old colliery, called the Fire Engine Pit. Although the proximity of these old workings was well-known, still there was not the slightest apprehension felt of any danger arising from them, as they had been, it was supposed, thoroughly drained previous to the re-opening of the main colliery. Unhappily these

opinions proved fallacious; for in one of the headings an opening was made into the old workings, and the water began to flow in apace. The men lost no time in attempting to plug the hole, but their efforts soon proved fruitless. The water gained on them with a rapidity that completely hurled them back by its volume and pressure. Seeing the danger that now threatened them, the alarm was given, and there was a general rush to the mouth of the shaft, the only way of escape. The usual danger signals having been exchanged with those at the mouth of the pit, the engine was brought into requisition, and not a moment lost in bringing up the men. Expeditious as they were, however, the flow of water was too impetuous for them, for in a very short time it was found that there was a perfect torrent pouring into the workings and rapidly extending itself even to the mouth of the shaft. Knowing that the water was thus rapidly overwhelming everything at the only place of escape, the anxiety of those above may be better imagined than described. Tram after tram was sent down with the greatest possible speed, and in a short time fifty-five men and boys and two horses were rescued. The number left in the pit is supposed to be 26, all of whom perished, together with the horses used below. Within two hours after the accident the water had risen 63 feet in the shaft, and by 4 o'clock it had reached 80 feet. As soon as the water had reached its highest point the engines were set to work to pump it out; but this,

from the principle of hydrostatics, that to reduce the water in one spot it is necessary to reduce the water over the whole, is a long and difficult task. It was, indeed, fully six months before the levels could be entered, and the bodies of the unfortunate men—of course in a frightful state of decomposition—removed for burial.

11. MYSTERIOUS DEATH AT RAMSGATE.—A very extraordinary case of murder or suicide has occurred at Ramsgate, the circumstances of which were so mysterious that the opinion of the public remained undecided to the end.

As a coast guardsman was on the look-out on the East Cliff, on the morning of Monday, the 11th instant, near the Dumpton stairs, about 6 A.M. he saw a boat on the beach. He descended and secured it. About 40 yards further he came upon the body of a man, quite naked. It was lying about 8 yards from the cliff, and the rising tide was washing over it. A coat, waistcoat, trousers, and flannel shirt were lying about 10 yards off; the pockets of each were turned inside out. Upon examining the body it was found that the deceased had come to a violent end. There was a wound in the breast, which passed through the chest, the left lung, and the left ventricle of the heart; it was larger internally than externally, as though the instrument had been moved after the blow had been given. This wound, the surgeons said, had certainly been inflicted during life, and must have caused instant death. The left hand had been cut off at the wrist; the four fingers were detached from the hand, the ring-finger cut off

between the first and second joints. There was a second cut on the wrist; there were three sharp cuts on the hand, as shown when the fingers were placed in position. The skin of the forehead, head, face, &c., was abraded, probably by the action of the water rubbing the corpse against the rocks. There was no cut on either the coat, waistcoat, or flannel to correspond with the stab in the chest. The collar of the coat showed signs of rough usage. About 70 or 80 yards from the body were found a shirt, the wristbands of which were torn off, and the remainder of the deceased's clothing; and a hatchet, of which the handle had been recently shortened, and the blade recently sharpened. About 500 feet from the body was a chalk rock upon which there were four distinct cuts of a hatchet. The pieces of hand and fingers were found about 12 yards and the hatchet 20 yards from the rock, towards the sea. It was deposed by the surgeons that the stomach of the deceased presented no signs that he had been drugged; but was full of food recently taken, and which smelt strongly of spirits. The Ramsgate boatmen declared that it was impossible that the deceased could have fallen over the cliffs to the spot where his body was found, nor could it have been washed there by any current of the tide. These are the particulars attending the discovery of the body. The question was, whether the deceased could possibly have committed suicide under such circumstances, or had been murdered and carried down to the beach. The appalling nature of the mortal

wound, which must have been preceded first by stripping and then by serious mutilation, seemed to render the first suggestion impossible; other circumstances, to be deduced from the preceding detail, rendered the latter improbable.

The appearance of the corpse indicated a man about 35 years of age, and a foreigner; and it appeared probable from the dress, a German. The porter of the Royal Oak Hotel, identified the deceased as a person who had come to the hotel about 10.30, on Saturday morning. He had a carpet bag and umbrella, and a *portmonnaie* containing 10 or 12 sovereigns and silver. He was also said, by other persons, to have had 40*l.* or 50*l.* in a secret bag, about his person. His boots were remarkable. Those produced were the same, but had been cut shorter in the leg. He wore a gold watch and chain, and a gold signet-ring on the forefinger of his right hand. His left hand was bandaged up. He left the hotel on Sunday morning, about 10 o'clock. He was next traced to a house of ill-fame, which he left alone about 3 p.m.; he was seen on the cliff about 8 p.m., walking with his arms folded and his hat over his eyes; he had his umbrella, but no carpet-bag; two or three persons were supposed to be watching him. He was not seen alive afterwards. Thus far, circumstances pointed to murder, perpetrated by persons who had become aware that he was possessed of a considerable sum of money.

Subsequent evidence tended to alter this view. It was ascertained that the deceased was a German or Dutchman; that he arrived at

Southampton, from America, about the end of March. That on the 31st of March, he left for London; and on the 7th of April (Thursday), he left London for Dover. A fellow traveller observed that his left hand was bandaged up; he wore a pair of long boots, his trousers tucked inside the legs. On Friday, he purchased a hatchet at a shop in Dover, and requested the shopman to cut the handle shorter. The piece cut off corresponded with the handle of the hatchet found on the sands. On Saturday he arrived at Ramsgate, and went to a barber's and had his moustache and beard shaved off. He then went to the Royal Oak Inn, as before stated. When he left that hotel at 10 a.m., on Sunday morning, he went to Margate, and took dinner between 11 and 12 a.m., at the Elephant and Castle, which he soon after left, taking his carpet-bag, the contents of which appeared to be weighty. He was then seen about the railway station. About 11.30 a.m., on Monday, a person found, at a corner of the Royal Crescent wall, two linen shirts, two collars, and other articles. The shirt corresponded with that found on the Ramsgate sands. In the afternoon, a boatman picked up from the water, near the same place, a carpet-bag open and empty. On Sunday afternoon, he was again at Ramsgate, was traced to the house of ill-fame, and was seen late in the evening, on the cliff, walking with a down-cast air, as before stated.

Some minute evidence showed that the deceased had shown a decided determination to conceal his name and nationality; but some letters which were found

scattered on the sands showed, that his name was Mattering, and that he was probably a Dutchman; they indicated also that his supposed possession of money had been greatly exaggerated. These particulars now tended to show that the unhappy man had committed deliberate suicide. But with what strange resolution and disregard to pain! If this conclusion be correct, he must have thrown his money, watch, and solid articles into the sea, then stripped himself naked: next have knelt down, and, placing his left hand on a mass of rock, resolutely mutilated his hand by chopping off his fingers, and then severing his hand from the wrist; and finally, after enduring so much self-inflicted torture, have stabbed himself by a powerful blow through the chest and heart, giving the weapon a lateral motion before withdrawing it! No knife was found—it had probably been washed away by the sea. The mutilation of the hand was, probably, intended to prevent identification; for one joint of the first finger, and two of the second had been amputated on some previous occasion. For the same purpose he had probably cut off the tops of his long boots, which may have had his name inside; all the marks had been picked out of his linen, and he had thrown away a German bible, and some other articles by which he might have been traced. The evidence which could be got together was so inconclusive as to the cause of the death of the deceased, that the coroner's jury returned an open verdict, and the matter remains involved in uncertainty to this hour.

THE INDIAN MUTINY.—*Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving for our Success.*—At the Court at Buckingham Palace, the 12th day of April, 1859—present, the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in Council—

“It is this day ordered by Her Majesty in Council, that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury do prepare a form of prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God for the constant and signal successes obtained by the troops of Her Majesty, and by the whole of the forces serving in India, whereby the late sanguinary mutiny and rebellion which had broken out in that country hath been effectually suppressed, and the blessings of tranquillity, order, and peace are restored to Her Majesty's subjects in the East; and it is ordered that such form of prayer and thanksgiving be used in all churches and chapels in England and Wales, and in the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, upon Sunday, the first day of May next.

“And it is hereby further ordered, that Her Majesty's printer do forthwith print a competent number of copies of the said form of prayer and thanksgiving, in order that the same may be forthwith sent round and read in the several churches and chapels in England and Wales, and in the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed.

“WM. L. BATHURST.”

A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God; to be used in all Churches and Chapels throughout England and Wales, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, on Sunday, the First Day of May, 1859, being the day appointed for a

General Thanksgiving to Almighty God: for the success granted to our arms in suppressing the rebellion and restoring tranquillity in Her Majesty's Indian Dominions.

O Almighty God, who by Thy Providence orderest all things both in heaven and earth; we desire to approach Thee this day with the voice of praise and thanksgiving. Thou hast graciously hearkened to the supplications of Thy people, who humbled themselves before Thee, and turned to Thee for succour in the hour of danger. Thou hast heard our prayer: Thou hast maintained our cause; Thou hast frustrated the treacherous designs which were formed against our Sovereign and her rule, and threatened British India with wasting and destruction. It hath pleased Thee to scatter our enemies, and to give victory to our arms, and to show that there is "no restraint with Thee to save by many or by few." We desire to confess, that it is through Thy mercy that the hearts of our countrymen have remained undaunted in peril, and patient in suffering: Thou hast guided the counsels of our rulers, and strengthened the hands of our soldiers; Thou hast comforted the widows and the fatherless, and through Thy Providence their affliction has been relieved. Grant, we beseech Thee, that every renewal of Thy loving-kindness towards our country may lead us to unfeigned thankfulness, and dispose us to walk more humbly and obediently before Thee.

And now, O Lord, when through Thy goodness tranquil-

lity has been restored to our rich and fruitful territory in the East, direct, we pray Thee, the minds of its inhabitants to the Author of our strength, and Source of our power, even to Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. Let the light of the everlasting Gospel disperse the darkness of idolatry and superstition which has encouraged their murderous rebellion. Teach them to prize the benefits which they have long enjoyed through the supremacy of this Christian nation, and so dispose the hearts of all who sojourn there that they may set forth, both by word and good example, the blessings of Thy holy religion. So shall the calamities from which we have been mercifully relieved, be over-ruled to the promotion of Thy glory, and the advancement of the kingdom of Thy blessed Son, our only Lord and Saviour: To whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and Glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

13. SINGULAR DEATH OF A BANK OFFICER.—Mr. David Ritchie, Secretary to the Committee of the Treasury at the Bank of England, met with a fatal accident, thus detailed by the officer who arrested the unintentional cause of it.

Police-constable Roberts said—At about 10 minutes before 10 o'clock this morning I was on duty at the statue in King William Street, when I heard a cry from the opposite side of the statue, and on running round I found a gentleman lying on the ground, upon whom a wine-pipe or cask had just fallen, from a van belonging to the South Western Railway Company. The

van was drawn by two horses abreast, and the driver was on the box, driving with the reins very quietly, at a walking pace. It was going towards Eastcheap from the direction of King William Street. There were eight empty casks on the van above the rails, four being on each side, and the cask that fell upon the gentleman fell from the off-side next to the tail of the waggon. It fell on his head, and I believe that he was dead when he was taken to the house of Mr. Smith, a doctor, in King William Street. I did not see the cask fall. The casks had ropes round them, and they were secured by hooks, or pieces of hoop iron, in the form of an S, one end of which was fixed to the rope while the other end had hold of the casks. When I saw it, after the accident, the pothook was still hanging to the rope, the other end having apparently given way. The whole thing looked like an accident. The driver was quite sober at the time, and he pulled up immediately upon hearing the cry, and waited till he was taken into custody.

Edward Taylor, a jobbing porter in the neighbourhood of King William's Statue said—I saw the cask fall from the waggon and knock the gentleman down, and I ran to pick him up. I found him lying on his back, and the blood was flowing from his nose and mouth. I, with some others, took him to Dr. Smith's. When I laid him down in the room there he fetched one breath and was dead in a minute afterwards. The waggon, which was going along very slowly at the time the accident happened, was

about three-quarters of a yard from the kerbstone, and I should think the gentleman had made one step from the kerbstone, as if to go behind the waggon, when the cask fell upon him.

George Adams, coachman to Messrs. Allsop and Son, said—I was sitting on the box of my carriage, which was standing at the door of No. 61, when I saw the waggon driven towards me at a slow walking pace, loaded with empty puncheons. I saw the gentleman come round to the front of the statue. He then stood still to let the van pass, and just as he had got one foot on the kerbstone and the other foot on the horse-road one of the puncheons fell on his head and knocked him down. The waggon did not run against anything so as to jerk the puncheon off.

The coroner's inquest found the unfortunate occurrence to be purely accidental, and the driver was discharged.

14. SINGULAR SUICIDE IN BLENHEIM PARK.—About mid-day, a foreign gentleman arrived at the Bear Hotel, Woodstock; ordered dinner to be ready at 6 o'clock, and then went into Blenheim Park, apparently for the purpose of sketching. He did not return. Soon after 4 o'clock his body was found on the ground under a clump of trees. The deceased had a pistol in one hand, with the finger still on the trigger; he had discharged it into his mouth, and the bullet had passed through his skull, and out at the back of his hat. In his pocket, among some money and valuable trinkets, were several letters, one addressed to the Duke of Marlborough, another to the landlady of the Bear. That to the Duke

of Marlborough was as follows:—

“Woodstock, April 14.

“MY LORD,—I humbly ask your Lordship's pardon and forgiveness for the great liberty I have taken in coming to put an end to my dreary and miserable existence in your park. It may be a childish feeling, but one cannot blow his brains out in a common road, or one of those cultivated fields full of cottages, and life, and civilization, and railways, and establishments of all kinds, of which your blessed country of England abound. So I have not found another proper place to die decently than your handsome park, and you must bear the inconvenience of a dead man in your grounds. I mean no offence.

“I have yesterday visited your house, hoping that the sight of good things, and chiefly good paintings, could do me good, and soften the wild ideas that had led me to put an end to my life; but all of no use. Your manor is one of the most noble, splendid things I saw in my life, and I have travelled about and seen nearly everything worth seeing. You have the finest Rubens that can be seen; that should have a great attraction for me under other circumstances, but now they have been of no use.

“I hope, with that splendid house, and park, and paintings, and library, you are happy, my Lord. If that is the case you will have a kind heart, and pity a poor devil come to die in your grounds. If, on the contrary, you are miserable also, as wealth is a medium, and do not constitute happiness, then you will say, like old Dido,—

VOL. CL.

“Non ighara mali, miseris succurrere disco,”

and pity me, and order that they shall leave me quiet, and bury me in the spot I have died, and put a cross on it in the Spanish fashion. I will be very grateful in the other world for it, if you do so, and wish not to trouble any more your lordship about me.

“I am, my Lord,

“Yours respectfully,

“A. ARROM DE AYALA.”

This letter was addressed outside, “To his Lord the Duke of Marlborough, Blenheim Manor, or where he may be.”

The letter addressed to the landlady contained singularly deliberate instructions as to what should be done when his body should be found. Another indicated that the deceased was a man of large means, probably engaged in the wine-trade, and contained an offer to discount for him certain bills to the amount of £21,000.

When his friends had arrived, it was found that the unfortunate gentleman was Don Antonio Arrom de Ayala, Spanish Consul for Australia.

15. DREADFUL BOILER EXPLOSION AT DUNDEE. — About 1 o'clock P.M., a dreadful boiler explosion took place at the spinning mill of Messrs. Edwards, of Scouringburn, Dundee, occasioning the loss of nineteen lives, and serious injuries to fourteen other persons, besides the damage to property. The immediate cause of the disaster was the explosion of one of the three boilers at the east end of the works. The boilers were built partly below the level of the street, and were surmounted by a fire-proof build-

E

ing. A public road bounded this building on the east, and an iron bridge connected it with the north wing of the works. A gentleman, who was passing along the Scouringburn at the moment of the accident, states that he saw a sudden cloud of steam rise round the east end of the works, then the entire building above the boilers perceptibly rose into the air, and fell down a mass of ruins to the ground. The first of the two flats into which the ruined building was divided consisted of an apartment for drying spun yarn, and the other flat was used for preparing flax, and was filled with the heavy machinery necessary for that purpose. The whole building was fire-proof, built of brick arches, cast-iron pillars, beams, and girders, and the floors were of brick and pavement. The alarm speedily spread, and praiseworthy, though for a time confused, attempts were made to relieve the sufferers. The work was most difficult, and the spectacles encountered were heart-rending. The poor victims were in many instances scalded and mangled so horribly that their relatives could not recognize them. One young woman was found gasping for life, her mouth fixed open, dreadfully scalded, and her arms literally boiled. She died soon after reaching the infirmary. Another young woman was found lying across a sharp iron beam, with a quantity of heavy machinery above her. She was, of course, quite dead, and nearly cut through. The heat arising from the hot water and the furnace was so intense that before the unhappy sufferers could be helped the hose had to be resorted to, to cool the machi-

nery and rubbish. Some of the women were found in the preparing machines at which they had been working. Of these many were frightfully mutilated by the force of the explosion; others were so scalded that the skin hung loose from their faces and limbs. Several other bodies were entirely roasted, and so mangled that they had lost the appearance of humanity. A woman's boot, with the foot in it, was picked up. The body of a dryer was found quite charred. The body of another man was found with the whole of one hand and the fingers of the other burnt off, and his feet and shoes shrivelled by the fire. As the remains of the dead and the half-living bodies of the sufferers were disengaged, they were conveyed to the infirmary, where some were so happy as to be speedily released from agony by death; others lingered long in torment, until they too were removed.

The destruction of property was not confined to the buildings and machinery where the explosion occurred. The windows of surrounding houses were driven in, the roofs half denuded of their tiling, and fragments were hurled to great distances.

15. OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BOAT RACE.—The annual boat-race between picked crews from Oxford and Cambridge was rowed over the accustomed course, between Putney and Mortlake. The weather was exceedingly unpropitious—there was a fierce north-east wind, with a cold rain and rough water, varied by drifts of sleet and snow. Before the meeting the Cambridge crew were greatly the favourites. In the preliminary pull they rowed beau-

tifully, while the style of the Oxonians and their boat was unfavourably criticized. The boats were started with great accuracy, and for the first 200 or 300 yards were oar and oar; but the Oxford boat then began to take a decided lead—it was manifest that the boat of their opponents was unsuited to the rough state of the water—kept it, and were evidently winning, when off Barnes a misfortune occurred to the Cambridge crew, which deprived them of the possibility of retrieving the day. The water, as has been stated, was rough; their boat plunged into the wave at every stroke, shipped a great deal of water, and was becoming water-logged, when a steam-boat, freighted with spectators, pushed so far forward as to send a heavy wash under the bows of the Cambridge boat, which was instantly swamped. Her gallant crew were easily rescued. The Oxford men rowed to the winning post at leisure.

18. DESTRUCTION OF KING'S NEWTON HALL.—King's Newton Hall, one of the most interesting old halls in Derbyshire, has been destroyed by fire. This fine old mansion was of historic interest. It was built by the Hardinge family about 400 years ago. During the Civil Wars one of this family was so ardent a loyalist that he raised a troop of horse for the king's service, and Charles visited his faithful subject at his residence, leaving a memorial of his visit in the anagram "*Cras-ero-lux*" (or "*Carolus Rex*") inscribed on a window-pane by his diamond ring. The hall is now the property of Lady Palmerston; but was the residence of Richard Green, Esq. It was most

appropriately furnished in the ancient style. All the fixtures, trophies, and furniture were destroyed.

24. STEAMBOAT DISASTERS IN AMERICA.—The American journals relate two terrible catastrophes on their rivers.

On the 24th of April the boilers of the steamer *St. Nicholas* exploded during the passage between New Orleans and St. Louis. Between 30 and 40 persons were killed, and many more injured. The captain met his death in a frightful manner. A heavy piece of timber, displaced by the explosion, caught his feet and held him fast. By almost superhuman effort he disengaged his right foot, but his left still remained fast. During this time he exhibited great solicitude for the safety of persons on the boat, and not until the flames had come within reach of his own body did he exhibit any anxiety for himself. Then, finding he could not release himself, he implored those near him, if they could not relieve him from his dreadful position, to bring an axe and cut off his leg. Every exertion was made to relieve him, but without avail, and he was consumed by the flames, meeting death manfully at his post. A young lady was thrown by the explosion from the state-room into the river, and floated down to the stern of the boat, when she caught her hand in one of the rings attached to the hull. Death threatened on either hand. To loose her hold was to sink into the waves, and to hold on was to burn with the wreck to which she was clinging—every moment being an age of alternating hope and despair. She remained in this position un-

til the flames actually burned the hair and skin from her head—the only part of her body above the water, except the hand by which she clung to the wreck, and that was burned to a crisp. Even in this dreadful position, the young lady had the heroism to seize by the hair a man who was floating by stunned, and held his head above water until both were rescued by a boat.

A short time previous to this catastrophe a collision took place on the Ohio, between the steamers *Nathaniel Holmes* and *David Gibson*. The collision was so effectual that the *Holmes* was crushed to pieces, and sunk instantly; and the *Gibson* sunk before she could reach the shore. The former vessel had “a large number” of passengers, nearly the whole of whom perished.

28. DREADFUL SHIPWRECK.—386 *Lives lost*.—During some severe gales which occurred on the Irish coast, an American vessel, the *Pomona*, struck on the Blackwater Bank, on the east coast of Wexford, and out of 409 persons all but 23 perished.

The *Pomona* was a vessel of 1500 tons register, owned and manned in the United States. She had a crew of 37 persons, and carried 372 emigrants. She sailed from Liverpool on Wednesday, the 27th, for New York. She left the Mersey with a fair and full breeze, and everything seemed to be going on well up to a late hour. Many of the passengers and a portion of the crew had retired to their respective berths; but a large number, more cheerfully inclined, had congregated together in the saloons, and were singing and dancing up to a late hour, there being both a fiddler

and piper on board. As the night advanced, however, the breeze freshened into a strong gale, before which the gallant ship flew as it were towards her destination, and most of the remaining passengers turned in. By some means, the captain, when nearing the Tuskar, seems to have lost his reckoning and mistaken his position; for a little past midnight the ship was driven on to a sand-bank some 7 miles off Ballyconigar, near to Blackwater, the sea making a clear breach over her and sweeping her decks. The passengers rushed in crowds to the deck, most of them but partially dressed, and many with only their night-clothes on. For a short time a wild scene of terror and confusion ensued, which, however, gradually subsided as the calm orders of the captain were obeyed by the crew, and something like order was re-established. The punps were quickly manned, and it was found that the vessel was fast making water; but the captain was in hopes that if the weather moderated he should be able in the morning to land all his passengers by means of his boats. In this, however, he was doomed to be disappointed, as the gale continued with increased fury during the whole of the day. In the course of the morning an attempt was made to launch the life-boats; but they were stove in and their crews drowned. In this fearful state of suspense they remained till towards evening, when the ship, which had till then remained firm on the bank, slipped off by the stern into deep water, and began to fill rapidly. The whale-boat was then launched, and a number of the crew and passen-

gers rushed into her. The captain, in the hope of being again driven on to the bank, let go the best bower-anchor; but all his exertions were fruitless, and though more than 40 men were working at the pumps, the water gained upon them so fast that in less than an hour the ship sunk. The heart-rending scenes that must have occurred during that hour are fearful to think of, but are known only to God, for beyond those in the boat not a soul was saved. The captain and first and second mates remained on the sinking ship, the only officer in the boat being the third mate, Stephen Kelly, who succeeded in reaching the shore in company with nineteen others of the crew and three passengers.

The wreck was perceived by the coast-guard, who conveyed the intelligence to Wexford. A steam-tug was engaged to go to her assistance; but the wind and waves set in-shore with such fury that many hours elapsed before she could steam out of the harbour; and when she arrived at the spot it was too late—the noble ship and her ill-fated freight had sunk beneath the waves—only the mizen-mast, with the colours still flying, remained above water.

On the following days the scene on the adjacent shores was heart-rending. Numerous bodies were washed up. The condition of the corpses showed the suddenness and unexpected nature of the catastrophe. Some were fully dressed, as though they had not retired to rest; others were in their night-clothes only. The conduct of the peasantry along the shore is stated to have been barbarous. The bodies were

plundered of any valuables that they bore with them—some were stripped of their clothes—some are reported to have been flung adrift into the sea, to conceal the treatment to which they had been subjected. Many of the unhappy passengers were of the better class—farmers and small country tradesmen seeking to improve their position in another land; but the great majority were emigrants from the Irish peasantry.

When the storm had abated the Liverpool agents sent divers to save as much as possible from the wreck. She appears to have held together on the bank. The scene they found below was terrible. Having made their way into the fore-part of the ship, it was evident that there the greater number of the passengers had met their fate. Their corpses were found clustered together in groups, such as it requires the firmest imagination to contemplate.

Numerous other wrecks occurred during the same gales. Three fine vessels were lost, with their crews, between Kingstown and Arklow. A vessel, named *The Dusty Miller*, was wrecked near Ireland's Eye; her fate was known only by her timbers drifting ashore, but nothing was ever heard of her crew of eleven persons. A large Dutch ship, name unknown, was lost on the Shipwash sand, on the Suffolk coast, when all her crew and passengers perished.

30. AGRARIAN MURDERS AND OUTRAGES IN IRELAND.—Some violent outrages, perpetrated during the first half of this year, gave intimation that the terrible secret tribunal was still at work.

On the 30th April a murder

was committed in the usually quiet county of Westmeath, which, taken with preceding circumstances, showed a deliberate system. About fifteen months since a respectable farmer, named Kelly, was murdered near his own house at Kilbeggan; the murderers escaped detection. The police were immediately quartered in the district, and the widow held the farm for some time under their protection. The same unknown power which had ordered the murder of Kelly, for the sake of the land, exercised its dark influence over the widow, who, terrified by secret warnings, surrendered the farm to the landlord. After lying vacant for some time, it was taken by Thomas Jessop, who, relying upon the protection of the police, removed to the house of the deceased Kelly. For some time all his motions were guarded by the presence of the police; but in an unlucky hour he returned from market without his usual escort; its absence was marked, and when he had reached to within a quarter of a mile from the temporary police barrack, he was fired at from behind a wall. The shot took effect in his abdomen, and after lingering for some days in agony he expired. Shocking to relate, this assassination was committed in the presence of three respectable farmers, who, whether intimidated by the secret tribunal, or themselves members of the league, not only did not attempt to secure the assassin, but even passed on without assisting the wounded man, or giving the alarm. Hitherto, Jessop's murderers, like those of Kelly, have escaped.

A strange Ribband outrage was

perpetrated near Letterkenny, Donegal. There was a dispute about a house lately purchased by a man named Hagerty. The fiat went forth that the house should be destroyed, and a strong party of Ribbandmen went to carry the decree into execution. They found Hagerty, and grievously assaulted and wounded him, and then commenced destroying the building with crow-bars, &c. The children in the house were hurt, and screamed; their mother rushing in to their rescue was wounded. The furniture was now turned into the road, and the work of demolition proceeded. To make this strange picture of Irish life complete—it was the wrong house—the house was not Hagerty's, nor the children, nor the wife! Hagerty was accidentally in a neighbour's house, and the ruffians stopped to make no inquiry before attacking him.

In May a farmer was murdered in Armagh, for having taken a farm from which the former tenant had been evicted.

In May also a murder was committed in Wexford. A small farmer was entitled to some land under the will of a deceased brother, on payment of a sum of money to another brother. The money was paid, and the devisee sought to obtain possession of the land. The tenants, however, refused to deliver up their holding, and on the unfortunate man threatening law proceedings he was shot: and there was too much reason to suspect that his brother was not innocent of the murder.

Other agrarian outrages of a lesser character have been committed, and some bad murders

are recorded in the Irish papers; but as these were crimes of the ordinary class, it would not be just to include them among special crimes.

30, GREAT FIRE AT BRISTOL.—A very destructive fire occurred at the sugar refinery of Messrs. Fridge and Tripp, at Bristol. The works consisted of numerous storehouses and buildings of great height, and covering a large extent of ground. At about half-past 11 on Saturday morning an alarm was given that a fire had broken out in one of the filtering houses in the older portion of the works. These houses were fitted with cylinders and other apparatus employed in the process of refining sugar, and the origin of the devastating calamity which ensued is said to be, that a carpenter, employed on some wood-work connected with some of the cylinders, incautiously set down a lamp near some felt packing. An ignition took place, the flames instantly communicated with the calcined charcoal in the cylinders, and the work of destruction commenced. There were on the premises nearly a thousand tons of this highly inflammable article, and the fire spread from cylinder to cylinder and from floor to floor, with frightful rapidity. The engines of the police force and the various fire offices, with their brigades, were quickly in attendance, and, with an unlimited quantity of water, endeavours were made to arrest the progress of the flames. These efforts were for a long time of little avail. Soon after 1 o'clock the entire range of buildings, which were upwards of 200 feet in length, and in breadth varied from 30 to 100 feet, was bright with fire.

Floor after floor fell in with a tremendous crash, and volumes of smoke and fire belched forth as if in defiance of the attempts which were being made to subjugate the flames. The immense warehouses of Pickford and Co., the well-known carriers, the sugar-bakery of Mr. Merry, and the bedding-manufactory of Messrs. Johnstone, caught fire several times, and it was only by incessant inundations of water that they were preserved. The fire had reached its highest point at about half-past 1 o'clock, at which time the scene was grand and appalling. The whole mass of buildings were wrapped in flames, which shot forth from every aperture, and ascended high up into the air with a fury which was magnificently terrible. At half-past 2, the block in which the fire originated fell in; and, in another hour, one of the walls of the most recent and extensive erection, also gave way. Then the fury of the fire was expended, but not extinguished. Throughout the whole night and all the following day, the exertions of the engines were unintermitted, and it was not until several days had passed, that the smouldering fire was effectually subdued. The total loss is estimated at little less than £100,000; the buildings, stock, and plant, were insured for £63,500.

THE WAR AND THE MONEY-MARKET.—The speech of the French Emperor to the Austrian Ambassador on New Year's day, and the subsequent indications of war, had produced a feeling of uneasiness in the different money-markets of the world, which increased as the season for military operations approached. The

Austrian loan of 6,000,000*l.* proposed in February affected the market somewhat; but when, at the end of April, it was announced simultaneously that a secret treaty had been concluded between France and Russia, that, although Austria had accepted the mediation of England, France had refused it at the instigation of Russia, and that France was about to raise a loan of twenty millions sterling, a panic seized the Stock Exchange; there was a fall of 6 per cent. in English stock and of 8, 10, 20 per cent. in Foreign Stock. Consols which, at the opening of the week, were 93 $\frac{3}{4}$ fell to 88 $\frac{1}{4}$ on Thursday; Exchequer Bills from 35*s.* premium to 5*s.* premium. French *rentes* had fallen since the commencement of the year 12 per cent; Austrian Stock from 84 to 45; Sardinian Stock from 82 to 65; Turkish 30 per cent. Nor were the effects less disastrous on securities of a local character. Railway Stock in England fell in proportion to the national stock; foreign railways were precipitated to an unsaleable point. The effect upon individuals may be conceived from the calculation, that in 24 hours the depreciation in value of stock and shares in England, was equivalent to fifty millions sterling. The failures on the Stock Exchange were numerous and heavy. On Wednesday, seven failures were announced, on Thursday eighteen, on Friday, nineteen. These were mostly professional brokers. The Bank advanced the rate of interest from 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and in the following week to 4 $\frac{1}{2}$.

At the commencement of the following week, the brokers had somewhat rallied from their

panic. The alleged treaty was denied; and then explained away into something quite harmless; it was discovered that we were not likely to take any share in the approaching contest in Italy; and that the French loan had been produced from the hidden hoards of the French peasantry, and would not affect the general money-market. The funds, therefore, rose considerably, and when the settling day arrived, some of the largest of the failed firms arranged their accounts satisfactorily, others paid large compositions; and the state of alarm and depreciation speedily passed away.

MAY.

2. EXHIBITION OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY.—In the opinion of the critics the Exhibition of this year presents great merits and great defects. While the gallery contains a large number of pictures which reflect, in tone and sentiment, the subdued and realistic spirit of the age,—admirably painted, excellent in composition, rich and true in colour, and telling their tale clearly,—there are few historical pictures, and those few do not aim at forcible expression of action or passion. The effects of the pre-Raphaelite school, and of the photograph, are very perceptible throughout. The works of the prophets of that school present their peculiar merits in a very marked manner; but the works of those younger artists who are insensibly influenced by their teaching are not improved by their borrowed skill. These realities, as every man sees

by the simple use of his eyes, necessarily lie upon the surface, and if these be rendered as they are presented to the sight by a skilful artist, a truthful and meritorious picture is the result. But unfortunately, while tangible truth is thus obtained, it is obtained at the sacrifice of that nameless spiritual essence which is seen by the intellectual eye. The picture is far excelled in hard truth by the photograph, and misses the high tone which is the product of the imaginative eye and poetic hand. The great picture of the year is undoubtedly Millais' "Vale of Rest"—the burialground of a convent, closed in from all the world by material and spiritual bounds. The sole external object is the purple motionless sky of a heavy evening. A nun digs a grave for a departed sister; another nun, who has been seated watching the progress of the work, has turned her face in contemplation of a rest beyond the grave. The supernaturally large, brilliant, but glazed eyes, the thin lips, the attenuated fingers, tell, with a melancholy pathos, that ere long another grave will receive a resigned tenant. At the first inspection the picture produced a painful impression; but with more acquaintance the pain passed away and left the deep, melancholy, but not unsatisfied sentiment expressed in the title. Mr. Millais has other pictures of more doubtful quality—works in which the good and ill of his school are abundantly to be found:—"Spring," an apple orchard, with girls; "The Love of James the First of Scotland." Three works of Sidney Cooper deserve especial notice—"A Dairy Farm in the Marshes—Kent," "A Sunny

Afternoon in Autumn," and "Effect at Sunset,"—the latter, a picture fully equal to any previous production of this master. Maclise exhibits but one work, "The Poet to his Wife." Landseer several, of which may be mentioned "Doubtful Crumbs," and "Prize Calf in charge of a Highland Lassie." Herbert, a remarkable single figure, a study for a larger picture, "Mary Magdalen approaching the Tomb of our Lord." Dyce's "Good Shepherd opening the gates to the lambs that are folded," a truly pre-Raphaelite production, in which the most spiritual and allegorical of subjective imaginations is reduced to the most hard and practical objectivity. Mr. Lee has two fine pictures, "Coast of Cornwall" and "Bay of Biscay." Egg's "Cromwell the night before Naseby Field" is a picture which can scarcely be beheld without awe, so powerful is the representation of the great Puritan captain wrestling in prayer within his tent, his open Bible resting on his naked sword. Stanfield, Robert, and Danby exhibit works of that customary excellence and type which render them always acceptable. Among landscapes Mr. Oaks exhibits a remarkable picture, "Marshlyn Mawr." Certain sequels, or companion pictures, attracted much notice. Cope's "The Younger Sister," a companion to his beautiful "The Younger Brother." Solomon's "Not Guilty," companion to "Waiting for the Verdict," but chiefest Mr. O'Neil's sequel to his "Eastward, ho!" entitled "Home again!" which few will forget. Other pictures of known artists deserve mention; for example, Ward's "Marie Antoinette listen-

ing to the Act of Accusation;" Horsley's "Milton dictating Samson Agonistes;" Faed's "Sunday in the Backwoods;" Creswick's "Under the old Bridge;" Cooke's "Dutch Peon at Harlingen;" and Mulready's "Mother and Child."

The Sculpture Hole offered nothing of ideal beauty calling for commemoration; but there were an unusually large number of portrait busts of persons of known eminence, by Theed, Marochetti, Thornycroft, Weeks, Woolner, and Foley.

The hand of death has been heavy this year upon the world of art. James Ward, the father of the Royal Academy, Leslie, R.A., Frank Stone, Ripplingille, and old David Cox, and the sculptor Bacon, have died within the year 1859.

3. THE ALBERT BRIDGE AT SALTASH.—The great engineers of our day seem, either by accident or design, to choose the construction of bridges as the point on which to measure their skill. Telford, in his suspension bridge over the Menai Strait, surpassed all other engineers in extent and in novelty of design, and reigned for many years the *Pontifex Maximus*. Stephenson surpassed Telford in the Britannia Bridge over the same passage, and established the supremacy of flat bridges on the tubular principle. Now Brunel has surpassed Stephenson in his Saltash Bridge, by a combination of the suspension and arch principle. This great work was formally opened to-day by the Prince Consort. This master-piece of engineering skill forms the viaduct by which the Cornwall Railway crosses the Tamar at Saltash. It would have been difficult to

throw a bridge of any kind over so wide an arm of the sea; but the requisitions made by the Government before they would sanction the line interposed difficulties well-nigh insuperable. Two of these were, that the waterway should not be interrupted, save by the single pier; and that the height clear over the water should be such as to permit the largest vessels to sail beneath without impediment. As the depth of the water was not less than 70 feet, with tremendous tides, and a bed of mud and shingle 20 feet deep lay above the rock on which it was necessary to rest, the mere raising a pier was a work requiring the greatest skill and ingenuity. For this purpose a vast cylinder of boiler-plate, 100 feet long, 37 feet diameter, weighing 300 tons, was sunk exactly on the spot where the pier was to rise. The water being pumped out, men were let down, who cleared away the mud and gravel within, until the cylinder had sunk by its own weight to the rock below, which was then hewn away until the cylinder rested on an even bed. The interior was then built up with solid hewn granite. On this massive pile the four iron columns for the pier were raised. These were cast-iron octagons, strengthened inside with ribs and angle-irons; each was ten feet in diameter, 100 feet high, and weighed 150 tons. These were placed at right angles, ten feet apart, and latticed together by strong iron-work, forming a square of 30 feet, and crowned by a platform or "standard" of iron weighing 200 tons. Such being the great central pier, the railway is brought from the hills on each side to the

water's edge, by seventeen smaller arches (each, however, of greater span than the widest of Westminster Bridge). From the two innermost piers the great arches span the spaces between the central pier, together a space of 900 feet, or wider than the Thames at Westminster. These wonderful spans are made upon the principle of a double bow. Each upper bow is an elliptical tube of wrought iron, 12 feet by 17 feet, strengthened within by diaphragms, tie-rods, and angle-irons; the lower bows are vast chains suspended from the ends of the tubular bows, and attached by drop-chains to the upper bows. The lower bows carry the roadway; and the principle carried out by this arrangement is, that in the exact proportion that the upper bows are affected by pressure below, the tension on the chains acts on the extremities of the bow, neutralizing the effect, and preventing any lateral thrust—an arrangement indispensable where buttresses were impossible. The inner ends of the bows rest upon the standard of the central pier, and are connected by wrought-iron trusses. The immense tubular spans were floated to the spot, and raised by hydraulic presses of immense power, the piers being built up under them progressively. The total length of the structure, from end to end, is 2240 feet, nearly half-a-mile, and 300 feet longer than the Britannia Bridge. The total quantity of wrought-iron used, 2700 tons; of cast-iron, 1300 tons; of masonry and brickwork, 17,000 cubic yards; and about 14,000 cubic feet of timber. The Cornwall Railway presents also some subsidiary wonders of skill.

There are two viaducts, one over Coombe Lake, the other at St. Austell, constructed of wood, 120 and 150 feet respectively above the water, quite as wonderful in their way as the great bridge over the Tamar.

4. LIMERICK ELECTION. — At the election of members for the city of Limerick, the candidates were Mr. Russell, Liberal, Major Gavin, the nominee of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and Mr. Spaight, Conservative. The two former were elected by a considerable majority. Party-feeling had run very high previous to and during the contest. When the poll had been declared, Major Gavin appeared in the street, "mounted on his favourite white Arab charger," and surrounded by men absolutely mad with excitement. The major, accompanied by these zealous partizans, rode through the principal streets. The mob then amused themselves by pelting the windows of persons known to be supporters of the opposite party; possibly these equally zealous politicians returned the compliment from the house-tops and any other coigne of vantage. Afterwards the skirmish became promiscuous, and the violence somewhat alarming. The police were severely pelted and some injured. To stop these outrages, a strong body of police was drawn up across Broad Street, and ordered to charge up the street with fixed bayonets. Thereon the crowd, in due form, ran away up the side streets and alleys; and when the police retired, again filled the street and recommenced battering the constables with stones. As the police necessarily commenced proceedings by dispersing the

mob without injuring them, the latter become persuaded of impunity and at last carry the game too far; and so it happened here; for the Riot Act having been read, and the rioters continuing their outrages, the police at length fired. The street was instantly cleared. It was then seen that the fire had been fatal, and that two men had been killed and five wounded.

6. TELEGRAM FROM INDIA.—*(Received at the Foreign Office, May 6, at 3.20 A.M.)*

“Alexandria, April 27.

“The Peninsular and Oriental Company's steam-ship *Northam* arrived at Suez early yesterday morning from Bombay, and brings the following news:—

“On the 2nd of April Rajah Maun Singh surrendered to Major Meade's five columns at Mahoodra. Tantia Topce was captured on the 8th by that force, assisted by the above-named chief.

“De Salis' and Rich's columns, by a combined movement, attacked the rebels in their flank and rear, and in one fight killed 500 of them, including many of their officers; the chiefs, however, managed to escape.

“The main body of the Oude rebels is still in Nepaul.

“Sir R. Shakspeare succeeds Sir Robert Hamilton, now *en route* to England.

“Lord Clyde, when last heard of, was at Delhi, on his way to Simla.”

6. ACCIDENT ON THE CORNWALL RAILWAY.—A severe accident has occurred at the Grove Lake viaduct of the Cornwall Railway. As the 7.25 train was on its journey from Plymouth to Truro, and was within 100 yards of the

viaduct which spans a small inlet of the river Lynher, the engine jumped off the line, dashed against and carried away the parapet of the viaduct, and was precipitated into the ravine below, carrying with it two carriages. The engine crossed the stream, and then turning over, buried the driver and stoker in the mud, in which they must have been immediately suffocated. The first carriage was crushed by the fall of the second, and the guard was killed; the carriage remained sticking in the mud in an upright position, and its few passengers were not much injured. The second carriage (a first-class) was turned over, and the passengers escaped with injuries. There was a third carriage in the train, but on the first alarm the guard applied the break with so much energy that the coupling broke and the carriage remained on the line.

9. WRECK OF H.M.S. HERON.—As Her Majesty's brig *Heron*, 12, Commander Truscott, was cruising off the coast of Africa, in lat. 5° 1' N., long. 15° 30' W., about 5 A.M., she was struck by a squall, thrown on her beam-ends, and quickly filled and sunk. The boatswain and gunner, and about 23 men, had time to get clear in the whale-boat. In a few minutes they were hailed by and took up Captain Truscott, who was swimming; he was badly bruised and much exhausted. As the boat was already overcrowded they pulled away. The mate, Mr. Blair, and about 20 men, got upon a top-sail yard; but this spar, having nothing to steady it, was so rolled over and over by the waves, that in a few hours only eight were left. These courageous

men caught spars as they floated by, and, exhausted as they were, formed a raft on which they floated more securely. They now caught sight of the jolly-boat, in which weresome Kroomensailors; but these pulled away to windward without an attempt to rescue. In two hours more they saw the cutter to windward. She had floated clear when the ship sunk, and the sailors who floated around secured her, baled her out, and immediately went to rescue the mate and his companions. They then pulled after the jolly-boat, which they took, and then returned to the floating wreck and picked up a few men who were still living. There were now 35 persons in the cutter; but the jolly-boat was so injured that she would carry no more than five men. In the same afternoon, they were so fortunate as to fall in with a ship which carried them to Ascension; and the whale-boat, with Captain Truscott and his crew, was also picked up and taken to Sierra Leone. Captain Truscott died on his way home of his wounds and exhaustion. The boatswain also died.

13. FATAL ACCIDENT AT THE WESTMINSTER PALACE HOTEL.—In the new Victoria Street, just beyond Westminster Abbey, an immense hotel is in process of erection. As the building will be of great height, and the walls have now reached a considerable elevation, a "scaffold shaft" has been constructed, up which all the bricks, mortar and other materials are conveyed, to be thence carried horizontally to those parts of the general scaffolding where they are required for use. A stage at the top receives these

materials in the first instance, and as the building rises, additional scaffolding poles are super-added to the shaft and the stage is removed higher. On the present occasion the scaffold shaft was 70 feet high, and a very large quantity of bricks, stone, sand, mortar and other substances, had been raised to and were now resting on the stage. The workmen went to their work at 6 A.M. Many had ascended and were at work on the scaffoldings; some were on the stage handling the materials, others were yet ascending the ladders, when suddenly, without any apparent cause, the ropes gave way, the poles snapped like reeds, and the piles of timber, bricks, and planking, came with a tremendous crash to the ground, bearing with them the unlucky labourers. Numerous workmen hastened to the spot and drew their unfortunate comrades from the mass. Five of these were found to be quite dead, their skulls crushed, and their limbs broken. Two others died; one on the way to the Westminster Hospital, the other two hours after admission. Five others were conveyed to the hospital suffering from dreadful injuries.

13. GREAT GANG OF BANK FORGERS.—The detection and conviction of a gang of forgers, who acted under the leadership of "Barrister Saward," otherwise "Jem the Penman," has been recorded in the Chronicle for 1857, page 35. The depredations of these evil-doers upon the banking community had been continued for several years, and amounted to a very large sum. On the conviction of Saward and his associates, the bankers had a

short respite: but it soon became evident that the survivors of the gang, or some fresh confederacy, was at work with equal skill and by a combination equally. It was known to the police that Wagner and Bateman, two men who had been transported for systematic forgery in 1852, had in 1856 received tickets of leave, and it was immediately suspected that these practised hands were the heads of the new gang. Thus directed in their search, the detectives discovered that Wagner and Bateman were not only in England, but were carrying on the business of law-stationers in York Buildings, Adelphi. This trading was of course but a blind. The police watched the premises for upwards of a year, and made themselves perfectly acquainted with every person that passed in and out. They became by this time aware that they had their eye upon a gang of eight or ten persons whose business was forging cheques and bills, manufacturing base coin, and defrauding the revenue to a great extent by forged receipt and bill stamps; but the precautions of the depredators were so skilful that not only could they obtain no evidence sufficient to justify them in pouncing upon them, but they could obtain no clue either as to the actual principal forger—the “penman”—or to the manufacturers of base coin and stamps. At length a forged cheque for 265*l.* was presented at the Union Bank. The forgery was detected, the bearer secured and recognised by the detectives as one of the frequenters of the establishment in York Buildings. By the clue thus obtained, the whole gang

were captured. They consisted of Wagner and Bateman, whose antecedents have already been stated; Humphreys, who carried on business as a private jeweller in Red Lion Square, occupying a house for which he paid 100*l.* a-year rent, and in which the officers found a large quantity of base gold and silver coin, and an apparatus for coining carried out to the latest discoveries in electrotyping and metallurgy; Bramwell, an agent and furniture dealer, Mead's Court; Foster, who seems to be a common petty larceny rogue; Chandler, formerly a discount agent, making a clear income of 2000*l.* a-year and spending 4000*l.*—he, therefore, naturally fell into the crime of appropriating the bills entrusted to him for discount, and ultimately became a known bill-stealer; and Glendinning, who seems to be engaged in the trade of passing forged cheques. During the fresh young days of the conspiracy, and until success had rendered them bold, the “penman” to the institution was a German, named Kerp, nearly 80 years of age, who had passed his long life in the imitation of other men's signatures, in the practice of which art he had not only acquired such exquisite skill, that his imitations passed for originals without suspicion, but, moreover, such wariness, that on the arrest of his confederates he instantly vanished—“*tenues secessit in auras*”—and the police could obtain not the slightest clue to his place of retreat. Chandler and Glendinning, seeing the game up, and perhaps being rather needy consenters than chiefs of such great designs, pleaded guilty to their indict-

ments, and, while in prison, developed the whole system to the admiring police. As the trials of the prisoners occupied several days, no better mode of conveying to the reader the intricate plot of the great conspiracy against the peace and pockets of the bankers suggests itself than to give in *extenso* the evidence of Chandler, who was brought from Newgate to give evidence against his associates. He said:—I was convicted at last sessions of several charges of forgery on my own confession. I know the prisoner Wagner, and became acquainted with him in or about May, 1857; it might have been April. I know a man, named Horton Bateman; they occupied a house in York Buildings, Adelphi, for some time, which Wagner rented. "Bateman and Co., law, parliamentary, and general stationers," was painted on the blinds. I was clerk to them from September, 1858, till the day I was apprehended, which was on the 1st of February last. There was only a trifling business in the stationery line. In November I saw the cheque produced; it was drawn on Messrs. Drummond for 440*l.*, purporting to be signed by George Wilton Chambers. I saw it in York Buildings. I had previously seen a similar cheque for the like amount; this was brought by a man named Kirk, and I knew this to be a forgery. It was given to Wagner. Several copies were made by myself and Bateman in Wagner's presence. I made the forged cheque in question. I know a man named Jones, who used to come continually from October last. Bateman and Wagner made an application to Jones to find a

man to cash the cheque, and he found one accordingly—a young man named Glendinning,—and an arrangement was made in presence of Wagner that Jones should advertise, and I wrote an answer to meet me at the Sablonnière, in Leicester Square, and I met him and walked some 200 yards with him, and gave him a cheque in a pocket-book. Bateman and Wagner were watching my proceedings. I told him to go to Drummond's and present it, and I returned to York Buildings. Jones brought me 440*l.* in banknotes within half an hour. I went out to meet Wagner and Bateman, who had missed Jones, but did not succeed, and returned and found them at the office. We all went into the city together, where the notes were changed—one for 40*l.* by Bateman, at Vaughan's, the butter dealer, and I took one to Knightsbridge for 100*l.*, and got Scotch notes for it. When all were changed, Wagner gave Jones 110 sovereigns to be divided between him and Glendinning. I had 70*l.*, and Wagner and Bateman the rest. The cheque brought by Kirk was returned with the mark "No effects" upon it. I had an uncle in Poland Street, Mr. George Whitehead, and he banked at the Union Branch, Argyll Place, and the prisoners had from me the information of the balance he had in his pass-book. Glendinning was sent to the bank for it, and Wagner received and brought it to York Buildings, and the next day I saw the cheque now produced, for 259*l.*, dated the 1st of December, 1858, on the Union Bank. Glendinning was to present the same, and Bateman to be at the bank with a cheque of

his own for 5*l.*, he keeping an account there. Soon after, Bateman came to York Buildings with the news that Glendinning was in custody, and Wagner came in shortly afterwards. Mr. Whitehead's pass-book, which up to then had been in the back office, was immediately thrown behind the fire, and we all entered into a subscription for Glendinning's defence. I recollect a proposition was made for a loan by a person named Croker, and Dr. Jones, of Albany Street, was to be security to Bateman and Co. Dr. Jones wrote, and his signature was copied to the cheque produced; but I do not recollect by whom—I think by a Frenchman. I changed the notes obtained on the cheque, which is for 250*l.*, in the city, at Massy's, and gave the notes which I there got to Wagner, receiving 40*l.* for my share. Humphreys was engaged in this transaction, and the rest of the money was divided between them. The cheque for 375*l.* produced, on the city branch of the Union Bank, I know to be a forgery. The 300*l.* note produced is part of the proceeds of that forgery. I know it by my own handwriting on it. I saw Bateman go into the bank for the cash, Wagner and I remaining outside. Bateman on coming out gave me some Bank of England notes, which I changed at Spielman's, Lombard Street, for French money—part paper and part gold. One of these notes was for 1000 francs, and Bateman, I believe, changed it for English money at Smart's, who gave the 40*l.* cheque produced, and he gave that cheque to Wagner, Bateman having in our presence made a copy of it. It

was made upon tracing paper. Shortly afterwards a blank form of cheque for the forgery was brought to York Buildings by Humphreys. It had no stamp upon it at the time. A die was made at York Buildings by us all in plaster of Paris, and afterwards in metal, and that was used for stamping the cheque in question. It then represented a cheque for 270*l.*, purporting to have the signature of Edward Kneller Smart, and an arrangement was then made with Jones, who said he knew a person, named Bramwell, who was in charge of an empty house, and he would present it, and to protect him a letter should be written to him from some one in the name of Wilson about taking the house. The letters produced were those written for the purpose. [Put in and read, the first dated the 9th of January, 1859, and the second the 20th of January, professing to enclose a cheque for 270*l.*, and saying the writer (Wilson) would call for the balance over 20*l.* for the fixtures of the house, which he had been asked for.] There was, however, no cheque sent. I posted one of these letters, I believe the last, and Jones the following morning met Wagner near the Nelson Column, where Bramwell was to pass, in order that Wagner might see him. I afterwards returned to York Buildings, and Wagner and Bateman came in about 12 o'clock, and Jones followed, and said an officer had been seen to go to Bramwell's house with him from the bank. A doubt was raised, and Wagner said Jones and Bramwell were conspiring to rob him of his regulars, and he would go and see for himself. Bram-

well agreeing, he went with Wagner to reconnoitre at the house, and on his return he said he had seen a strange man smoking a pipe at the window. [This was the detective who was watching them. Bramwell asked the officer for a light, and lighted his cigar from his pipe.]

Cross-examined.—I have perhaps been concerned in many robberies, and at Wagner's suggestion, having been robbing the bankers as much as I could.

The evidence of the accomplice was confirmed in every particular open to corroboration by a host of witnesses whom the intelligence of the police had brought together, and the whole gang were convicted. Wagner and Bateman were sentenced to penal servitude for life; Humphreys to 20 years', Bramwell and Foster to 10 years', penal servitude.

It is computed that during the short period of their career—about two years—this formidable gang had obtained from the bankers between 8,000*l.* and 10,000*l.*, and that the cheques which had been refused when presented amounted to double that sum. One of the gang (probably Wagner) is said to have opened a communication with the Government officers, offering to disclose to them the system by which the Exchequer was defrauded of vast sums annually, by means of forged stamps, on payment of 3000*l.*

19. TELEGRAM FROM INDIA.—*(Received at the India House at 3 A.M.)*

“CENTRAL INDIA.

“Tantia Topee was tried by court-martial on the 15th inst.,
VOL. CI.

at Sepree, sentenced to death, and hanged on the 18th.

“A body of rebels under Adil Mahomed Khan was surprised near Futtehpoore on the 19th, and routed with a loss of several killed and wounded.”

CAPTURE AND EXECUTION OF TANTIA TOPEE.—It has been a subject of frequent remark that while, in past ages, the peninsula of Hindostan has been fertile in warlike sovereigns and great conquerors, and in adventurers who have founded dynasties by their military genius, the great Indian rebellion, with all its inveteracy of race against race, of creed against creed, of the conquered against their subjugators, should have produced no one man, whose military and administrative talent has given us the slightest alarm. One only has shown any sparkles of enterprise and skill, and he has now paid the forfeit of his rebellion and cruelty. On the 8th of April, Tantia Topee, after 23 months of active rebellion, was captured by his pursuers, on the 15th he was brought to a court-martial, and on the 18th, according to the sentence of that tribunal, he was hanged. So ends the career of this celebrated marauder; but so striking is his history and so thoroughly Asiatic was the course thus consummated that some closing notice of its incidents has been fairly earned.

It has been found impossible to ascertain, with any precision, the extraction, quality, or even name of a man who, for nearly two years, has been successful either in defying our arms or eluding our pursuit. Tantia Topee was undoubtedly a Brahmin; but beyond this distinction

F

of caste, his position was attended by no advantages. He is said to have been born somewhere in the Mahratta country, and to have been at some period of his life in the service of the British Government; but his history is altogether obscure, until at the outbreak of the mutiny he appears, probably as a retainer of Nana Sahib, at Cawnpore. From this moment his rise commenced. He left Cawnpore for Calpee, where he acquired a considerable command in the Gwalior Contingent, and was conspicuous among the leaders of that famous force at the battle of the Jumna, when General Wyndham was so hardly pressed. After the defeat of the Contingent, he succeeded, by one of the boldest strokes of the war, in turning repulse into victory, for he made his way to Gwalior, and by dint of corruption and intrigue turned Scindiah's troops against him, and obtained actual possession of his capital city. Dislodged from this marvellous elevation by the vigorous proceedings of Sir Hugh Rose, he took to the open country, and for nearly a year defied our utmost power. He raised armies as fast as we could disperse them, took up one position after another to our infinite annoyance, and led us a chase which, despite of unexampled efforts on the part of our soldiers, seemed to be really endless. Our troops pursued him without intermission, contrived more than once to surprise him, repeatedly captured his artillery, and scattered his troops, but could never deprive him entirely of followers or guns. He seemed to summon forces from the earth

as if by magic. As the pursuit grew hotter and hotter he mounted his men on ponies and camels, and marched, it is said, at the average rate of 60 miles a-day. Wherever we found him he had always cavalry and guns, and these he posted with remarkable skill. It is alleged, as a climax of these almost incredible exploits, that this military genius and popular hero was deficient in the commonest of all qualities—that of personal bravery; nor is the assertion disproved by the intrepidity with which he met his end. It is a known trait of Hindoo character, that men whom no persuasions could induce to face a battery or conduct a charge, will await inevitable death with fortitude and composure.

To those who have brought the aids of experience or knowledge to the study of this great rebellion the career of Tantia Topee will present a spectacle of peculiar interest. It is literally the only incident of the war which resembles the incidents of times gone by. Tantia Topee is the one military adventurer brought to light by the convulsions of 1857. The fact deserves most serious reflection; for it bears immediately and forcibly upon our own position in India. Be it remembered that for half a century we had been training soldiers, and that in Bengal alone there were 150,000 natives under arms when this revolt broke out. Now, in all this enormous host there was not a single man who, when the bonds of allegiance and discipline were abruptly removed, displayed the intuitive capacities of a military commander. Not

at Delhi, nor Bareilly, nor Lucknow, did there appear a man who by force of genius or ambition could mould those around him to his purpose. The two years of the revolt, with all their opportunities, never produced one native general. The sepoys had learnt artillery and rifle practice and the routine of professional discipline. They retained to the last their regimental organization, and continued their duties so mechanically that "God save the Queen" was performed at night-fall in the rebel garrisons; but beyond this level they never rose. One man alone reproduced the old Indian character, and that man was Tantia Topee—an obscure civilian, without place or power. He, by the light of nature alone, discerned the strong points of the rebels' position and our own weak points. By the exercise of that faculty with which heroes are gifted he could always, even in his most desperate straits, draw followers to his standard. He discovered intuitively that his best chances lay in harassing us by incessant attacks and exhausting us by fruitless expeditions. He had great military aptitude; for his positions were always well chosen and his retreat always secured. It is even said that his political foresight was considerable, and that his designs included an irruption to the Decan, on the speculation of being joined by the Mahratta population, if not by some battalions of the Bombay army. In this hope, however, he was disappointed; for though he long eluded our pursuit he could never quite baffle our flying columns, and they kept the passes even when they could do no more. It tells

well, indeed, for the enterprise of our commanders and their troops that so active a marauder as Tantia should have been so long prevented from doing his worst, and have been caught at last. He was repeatedly headed, constantly turned back from the objects of his march, and at length fairly overtaken.

After his capture by Col. Meade, Tantia Topee preserved a calm and resolute demeanour. He steadfastly averred that he was not present or cognizant of the massacre of Cawnpore, or of the death of any Europeans except in fair fight. He was certainly at Cawnpore on that terrible day. Whether he was conscious of his guilt and knew he had no mercy to expect, or that he was buoyed up by ambition and the hope of success, he refused the opportunity of the amnesty, and carried on a war which cost us many lives for ten months longer. Mercy would, therefore, have been out of place. He, at any rate, appeared to have made up his mind that his fate was inevitable, and treated all the formalities of his court-martial as a useless preliminary.

The Nawab of Furuckabad, a miscreant of far deeper die—second only to Nana Sahib himself,—has escaped his just doom. He was tried on four charges. First, of having massacred 40 Europeans—gentleman, ladies, and children—on a sand-bank in the Ganges, on the 4th of July, 1857; second, with the massacre of 22 Europeans, and East Indian and Native Christians; and thirdly and fourthly, with the murder of other British subjects. He was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged. But it seems that the

officer to whom he surrendered had used words which were construed into a promise that his life would be spared; and as it was of the utmost importance at this stage of the mutiny that there should not be the slightest suspicion cast upon the good faith of the Queen's Proclamation, the Nawab was permitted to retire with his family, on a pilgrimage to Mecca; but his sentence of death to be carried into effect if he should ever return to Her Majesty's dominions.

21. THE WAR IN ITALY. BATTLE OF MONTEBELLO.—*Electric Telegram.*

“Paris, Saturday, May 21.

“The following despatch from the Emperor to the Empress has been posted on the Bourse:—

“Alessandria, Saturday, May 21.

“A body of Austrians, about 15,000 strong, attacked the advanced posts of the corps under Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, but were repulsed by General Forey's division, which behaved admirably, and cleared the village of Montebello of the enemy after an obstinate fight of four hours.

“The Piedmontese cavalry, commanded by General Sonnaz, fought with extraordinary energy.

“Two hundred prisoners were taken, including one colonel.

“The loss on the French side amounts to 500 killed and wounded.

“The Austrians have been retreating since yesterday evening.”

—SINGULAR ACCIDENT BY A FLY-WHEEL.—At the Consett Iron Works, a part of the machinery, requiring immense power, is driven by a fly-wheel 24 feet in diameter, and weighing 20 tons. While this ponderous wheel was

revolving in 70 revolutions a minute, it flew into fragments. The consequences were most disastrous. One fragment, flying upwards, cut a hole through the roof of the mill 160 feet in length and 40 feet wide. Another portion struck through a wall and fell 21 feet on the other side. A third portion struck the ground and was deeply imbedded in the soil. Other fragments did considerable injury to the property around. The roof fell upon and buried four men, one of whom was killed instantly, another had both legs smashed, and the other two were seriously injured and burnt.

21. SHOCKING RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—A most distressing accident occurred on the Bangor and Carnarvon Railway. A woman named Catherine Evans, wife of a farm-labourer, attempted to cross the line at a place called Griffith's-crossing, to meet the train which leaves Bangor at 4 P.M. She saw the train approaching and hesitated, but attempted to cross, when her foot tripped and she fell across the rails. The whistle of the engine-driver (who could not stop the train) brought out the stationmaster, Mr. William Anwyl, who courageously rushed to rescue her. In a moment the train was down upon them both. Anwyl was struck on the head by the step of the engine and killed on the spot. The whole train passed over the poor woman. When picked up many yards from where she fell she was fearfully mutilated. Her head was completely severed from the body, one arm cut off below the elbow, and her leg broken and crushed. The wife of the unfortunate sta-

tion-master was on the platform and witnessed the death of her husband.

28. THE RED SEA TELEGRAPH.—A very important and difficult "length" of the electric communication between the country and her Indian empire—the line between Suez and Aden along the entire course of the Red Sea—was this day completed.

The idea of establishing a communication between Europe and the East *viâ* Egypt and the Red Sea had been long entertained; but a prejudice prevailed that the bottom of that inlet was so beset with shoals and coral rocks as to render the existence of a cable precarious; and in consequence, the English Government rather favoured the project of a line up the Persian Gulf, along the Euphrates, and through the Turkish dominions. The report of Captain Pullen, officially appointed to examine the Red Sea, showed that the difficulties had been, to say the least, greatly exaggerated; and a Company was formed for the purpose of laying down a line from Kurrachee, at the mouth of the Indus, to Suez, in connection with a line from Suez to Alexandria.

Very large powers were granted to the Company by the Porte and the Pasha. Besides the right to establish stations at all convenient points, the Company have the entire and absolute control over all the *employés*, and over all messages. The contractors for the cable were Messrs. Newall and Sons. The cables having been shipped on board two steam-vessels, the *Imperador* and *Imperatriz*, and the Egyptian end having been properly secured to the shore, the *Imperador*

steamed out of Suez roads on the 9th of May, and reached Cosseir, where there is a station, in 48 hours, the cable paying out with great regularity, and with very little "slack." Greatest depth between the two points 350 fathoms. From Cosseir to Suakin occupied 4 days. Greatest depth 450 fathoms. The cable on board the *Imperador* being nearly all paid out, a junction was made with that stowed in the *Imperatriz*, and the latter paid out the length between Suakin and Aden. In this trajectory an accident occurred, and it was necessary to pick up nearly 4 miles of the cable from 250 fathoms, which was accomplished by "underrunning" without difficulty. Greatest depth 250 fathoms. The bottom, throughout the whole length—contrary to all representation—was found to be even, and to consist of mud, sand, and small shells, with the *débris* of coral, so friable as to be easily pulverized between the fingers. Not a single coral reef was crossed. The shore-end at Aden was speedily completed, and on the 28th, Brigadier Coghill, the Political Resident at Aden, sent a message to the Queen: "Your Majesty's possessions at Aden are in telegraphic communication with Egypt." The acknowledgment was received from Suez in less than five minutes!

At a later period the cable was successfully laid between Kurrachee and Muscat, whence there will be little difficulty in carrying it on to Aden. The length between Suez and Alexandria is nearly ready; the cable is ready for the space between Alexandria and Candia; and from

that island to Constantinople the line over Asia Minor is partly in operation, and from that city there is communication over all Europe. It is also proposed that there shall be lines from Candia to Malta, and thence both to Sardinia and Gibraltar; so that our correspondence with our Eastern possessions may be as little as possible under the control of any European power.

29. EXTRAORDINARY HAILSTORM.—The records of extraordinary storms are usually the local newspapers, who find a grim satisfaction in searching out the most terrible forms of these visitations. According to these authorities, no hailstone falls under the size of "a pigeon's egg," while many are observed to exceed "a hen's egg;" the flashes of lightning are always "incessant," and the rain always falls "in a deluge." These exaggerations naturally produce a contrary effect to what was intended—they are passed over as conveying little meaning. When, however, a scientific and authorized observer makes statements of this character, the phenomena are worth recording, and in this manner Mr. Lowe, of the Beeston Observatory, near Nottingham, describes a storm which visited that neighbourhood on the 29th May. After describing storms of a somewhat unusual character, which had been observed in the morning, Mr. Lowe says, "From 6.30 till 6.54 p.m. a cessation of the thunder; at 6.50 huge rain-drops, which covered a space on the stones of above 3 inches in circumference; at 6.54 a flash of lightning, followed incessantly by hailstones; 6.54½ a flash in N.W., 1½ mile distant,

and another in the S.E. 1½ mile distant; 6.55 hailstones, an inch in diameter commenced falling; at first the stones were 2 or 3 yards apart, mingled with enormous rain-drops. These stones were perfectly circular and very smooth on the surface. 6.57 the hailstones fell thickly, many being of most grotesque shapes; the largest measured 1½ inches in length; however, larger fell; for 23 minutes after the storm had ceased, one was found measuring 1½ inch and ¾th of an inch in the widest part. The stones fell very gently, considering their extraordinary size; indeed, I have received much smarter raps from small hailstones than I did from these. At the commencement of the storm the temperature on the grass was 66 degrees, and at 3 inches above the grass 68 deg. The hailstones lowered the temperature on the grass to 55.5 deg., and at 3 inches above the ground to 56.5 deg. This great warmth would cause the stones to commence melting as soon as they reached the ground. The hail ceased at 7 o'clock and the rain at 7.3. The average size of the stones was half an inch in diameter. The principal forms were round, acid-drop shaped, and a small circular stone attached to a larger one, the general proportional size being as 3 to 1. There were, however, very many closely resembling an appearance of Saturn with his ring, and another prevalent form very like a fryingpan with a short handle. Among the more remarkable shapes, one represented a section of an orange; another a close representation of a leg of mutton; another a comma; another a sheet of glass; while

others were too grotesque for any but pictorial description. Some were as transparent as glass, others opaque or semi-opaque, some transparent with an opaque circular centre, others opaque with a transparent centre; a few were hollow, and many were transparent with an opaque circular portion on one margin closely resembling a crescent moon. Many had minute bubbles of air enclosed within them, and in several these bubbles were of large size. At 8.20 p.m. a curious pillar of light rose through the thunder-cloud 25 deg. into the air at an angle of 45 deg., apparently from where the sun had set; it was black, except the northern edge, which was tipped with orange; it lasted four minutes." Early in the morning of the following day, a violent storm passed to the south of Beeston, with much thunder and lightning, about 10 flashes a minute. On the 31st May, a violent storm passed over Bristol, during 18 minutes of which six-tenths of an inch of rain fell. During the day 0.995 or nearly one inch of rain fell.

FATAL THUNDERSTORM.—The hot weather has had its usual accompaniment in some severe storms of thunder and lightning. On the 29th and 30th May (the period when the above singular hailstorm was observed by Mr. Lowe), at Chelmsford a builder's yard was set on fire and destroyed, a chimney shaft was struck and cast down, several persons were struck and stunned, and the windows of an Independent chapel were broken by a terrific peal of thunder, which followed the destructive flash. At Fornham, Suffolk, a labouring

man who had taken refuge under a hedge, was struck and killed instantaneously. Another man was killed at Ely. Many buildings and trees in the neighbourhood were injured and shivered. On the 4th June, in London, as observed at Camden Town, there was a thunderstorm so continuous that for 40 minutes there was no interruption of the reverberation longer than 10 seconds. On Sunday, the 12th June (Whit-Sunday) a severe storm destroyed the hopes of the pleasure-seekers. At 1.30 p.m., a vivid flash of lightning gave the signal for the storm, which followed in flash after flash, with terrific peals of thunder, and tremendous rain. An old gentleman was struck by the lightning, near the Old Kent Road, and much injured. The basement of the houses in low localities were inundated by the rain-floods, and many buildings at the east end of London, the river, Norwood, Sydenham, and Dulwich, were struck. About the same time a very severe storm, with large hailstones, broke over Chippenham and many other places. On the 26th there was a storm over Clapham, Morden, Wandsworth, Cheam, Epsom, and Erith, in the course of which many trees were split by the electric fluid. A man, seeking refuge under one of the trees on Clapham Common, was struck dead. On the 4th June .531 inch, or more than half an inch of rain is recorded to have fallen at Camden Town, and on the following day nearly a quarter of an inch, and on the 12th more than one inch.

31. THE WAR IN ITALY.—**BATTLE AT PALESTRO.**—*Electric Telegram.*

The *Moniteur* of Wednesday morning contains the following telegram:—

“Vercelli, May 31.

“The Austrians, in great force, energetically attacked the King of Sardinia this morning, and tried to hinder our troops from passing the river; but the Sardinians, supported by the Division Trochu, which, however, took little part in the engagement, valiantly repulsed the Austrians. The 3rd Regiment of Zouaves, which was attached to the Sardinian division, performed wonders. Although unsupported, and in front of an Austrian battery of eight guns, which was served by the infantry, the Zouaves crossed a canal, ascended the heights, which were very steep, and charged the Austrians with the bayonet. More than 400 of the enemy were thrown into the canal, and six pieces of cannon were taken by the Zouave Regiment. The Sardinians also took two pieces of cannon.

“Our loss was inconsiderable.

“The Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour has been conferred by the Emperor on General Forey.

“The Generals Sonnaz, Blanchard, Cambriel, and Belfond have been appointed Commanders of the Legion d'Honneur.”

(SARDINIAN ACCOUNT).

“Turin, May 31.

“A fresh victory has been gained by our troops. At seven o'clock this morning 25,000 Austrians endeavoured to re-take the position of Palestro.

“The King, commanding the fourth division in person, and General Cialdini at the head of the 3rd Regiment of Zouaves, re-

sisted the attack for a considerable time; and then, after having successfully assumed the offensive, pursued the enemy, taking 1,000 of them prisoners, and capturing eight pieces of cannon, five of which were taken by the Zouaves. 400 Austrians were drowned in a canal.

“During the combat at Palestro another fight took place at Confienza, in the province of Lomellina, in which the enemy were repulsed by the Division Fanti after a two hours' conflict.

“Last night a picket of the enemy endeavoured to pass the Po at Cerversina, but were repulsed by the inhabitants.

“The Austrians have evacuated Varzo, in the province of Bobbio.”

“Turin, June 1.

“OFFICIAL BULLETIN, PUBLISHED TO-DAY.

“The victory gained yesterday, the 31st, has been followed by a second victorious combat, which took place at 6 o'clock in the evening, at Palestro, which the enemy endeavoured to re-enter, but was repulsed again by the Division of Cialdini, composed of the Zouaves and Piedmontese cavalry.

“The King pressed forward where the fight was most furious, the Zouaves vainly trying to restrain him.

“Yesterday the Austrians attacked the Sardinian vanguard at Sesto-Calende; the fight lasted two hours.

“Our troops crossed the Ticino in pursuit of the enemy.

“A numerous Austrian *corps d'armée* appeared before Varese. Garibaldi ordered the National Guard not to resist, and fell back on the Lago Maggiore.

“An attack was attempted by

our troops against Laveno, on the Lago Maggiore, but without result."

STATISTICS OF ITALY.—The following statistical statements relating to the beautiful country, the battle-field of the present war, are taken from *Annuario Statistico-Italiano* for 1858:—"The population of Italy amounts to no less than 27,107,047 inhabitants. They are divided into 15 circumscriptions—eight, containing 19,913,304 souls, are under Italian Governments; and seven, with a population of 7,193,743, obey foreign rule. Italy contains 110 provinces and 10,012 communes, and is one of the countries in which the largest cities and towns are to be found, 19 of them having more than 50,000 inhabitants, and 8—Rome, Naples, Palermo, Venice, Florence, Milan, Genoa, and Turin—exceed 100,000. Almost all the population are Roman Catholics; the number of those who profess other Christian creeds only amounting to 36,676, and the Jews to 41,497. The births far exceed the deaths; the increase in the population is particularly remarkable in Sicily and Tuscany, where it may double in 73 years. Italy alone has very nearly one-half as many bishoprics as there are in the whole of Europe; 256 out of 535. The average is 90,000 Catholics for each diocese, and in the Roman States there is one bishop for every 400,000 souls. The regular and secular clergy of both sexes count in Italy 189,000, and they are, as compared with the number of the population, as 1 to 142. The clergy are more numerous in Sicily than in any other part of Italy, or perhaps in

the world, the number of priests, monks, or nuns, being 33,266, or 1 out of 69 inhabitants. There are nearly 300 journals published in Italy, of which number 117 are in the Sardinian States, although they contain only one-fifth of the total population. About the middle of 1858, Italy possessed 1757 kilometres (five-eighths of a mile each) of railways completed, 2339 in course of construction, and 634 for which concessions had been granted. One of the principal branches of industry is the production of silk, and in ordinary years the value of that article is from 200,000,000 f. to 230,000,000 f. Lombardy alone, which is only the fifteenth-part of Italy, produces one-third. The revenues of the different Italian States amount to about 600,000,000f. and the expenses to 640,000,000f. The public debt is 2,000,000,000f. Commerce is active, but business is much impaired by the high tariffs in many of the States, and by the lines of Custom-houses. The mercantile-marine of Italy is more numerous, in proportion to the extent of country, than that of any other nation in Europe, England excepted."

31. EPSOM RACES.—Magnificent weather and excellent sport made the great people's meeting pass off with great *éclat*. The Craven Stakes were won by Zuyder Zee; the Woodcote by Baron Rothschild's Restes. On Wednesday the great Derby Stakes were carried off by Sir J. Hawley's Musjid; 246 subscribers; 33 started; value of Stakes, 6750l. On Friday the Oaks Stakes were won by Lord Londesborough's Summerside; 168 subscribers; 18 started.

31. MURDER AND SUICIDE IN GALWAY.—A painful tragedy has happened in the county of Galway. Captain Ffrench is the son of the Honourable Martin Ffrench, a gentleman possessing considerable property in the neighbourhood of Ballinasloe. The son has been recently married, and has been spending his honeymoon in London, only reaching Dublin on his return on Monday evening last. He left his wife and went to Mitchell's Hotel to smoke a cigar; and from there, it is since ascertained, that he must have started immediately by train for Ballinasloe, where he arrived at 11 o'clock the same night. He now went to St. Brandon's, a house belonging to his father on the family estates. Here he expected to find Mr. Burke, his father's agent, a gentleman on terms of personal friendship with himself. Mr. Burke was at Ballinamore, however, some 3 miles off, and to that place Captain Ffrench sent a letter asking him to come at once to St. Brandon's. This he immediately did. The meeting between Captain Ffrench and Mr. Burke is described as warm and cordial in the extreme. After a very short delay the two drove over in a car to the house of Mr. Cheevers. This gentleman, however, was out, and the car-driver was directed to take them to Ballinamore Park, the principal seat of the family. At the park gates they got down, and walking off, disappeared into the plantation and were never again seen alive. At about five in the afternoon a gamekeeper discovered the dead body of Mr. Burke lying in the plantation, pierced with two pistol bullets, the singed

coat showing that the weapon must have been only a few inches from him when fired; and news shortly arrived that earlier in the afternoon Captain Ffrench had been found dead on Lord Clonbrock's estate, about 4 miles off, with a discharged pistol by his side and the bullet in his heart. Nothing could be discovered that could throw any light on the circumstances attending Mr. Burke's slaughter. It was stated at the coroner's inquest that Captain Ffrench had been subject to temporary fits of insanity throughout his life, and while in that condition had made more than one attempt on the life of his fellow men.

—WORKS OF ART AND VERTU.

—Among the numerous objects of fine art or curiosity which have recently changed hands are to be enumerated the famous Gonzaga Casket, composed of upwards of 300 pieces of *crystal de roche*, mounted in ebony, and most richly decorated within and without. This beautiful example of the art of the early 16th century was designed by the great Bramante, and the silver-work was executed by Benvenuto Cellini, and is in the most perfect preservation. It was sold for 500 guineas. A magnificent oviform centre vase and cover of the finest old Sèvres, *gros-bleu* ground, 590*l*. A pair of oviform vases and covers, of old Sèvres, 556*l*. A cabaret of the finest *gros-bleu*, old Sèvres, exquisitely painted, 845*l*.

JUNE.

2. BURNING OF THE "EASTERN MONARCH."—The destruction of this ship by fire at her anchor at

Spithead adds another chapter to the naval history of this country. What British seamen and British soldiers will do against the foe in the stern combat, when the warrior strives in his professional vocation, the blood is up, and the alternative is honour or disgrace—this is recorded in many a glowing page. We have seen too in the case of the *Birkenhead*, when, amid the unknown terrors of shipwreck, 400 disciplined soldiers went down in their ranks. But of all forms of destruction to which human beings are exposed that of a fire at sea is the worst. The torture is prolonged, the resistance all but hopeless, the alternative of death by fire or water more dreadful than if no choice were offered. In the case of the *Eastern Monarch*, at anchor in our own roadstead, escape was possible to a few resolute and powerful men, while the choice behind lay between death and death. Yet the men sustained the dreadful danger with the nerve of heroes and the obedience of disciplined minds—and they had for their reward that all—nearly all—were saved. The *Eastern Monarch* was a splendid ship, perhaps the foremost amongst the sailing ships which pass between the British Islands and the Indian shores. She had sailed from Kurrachee on the 22nd of February last, bringing home, besides her crew and officers, 352 invalid soldiers, 30 women and 53 children. She had touched at St. Helena; but the run between that island and the English coast had been prolonged in consequence, at first, of light baffling breezes, and, finally, of the east wind, with which we have been so long afflicted at

home. The result was, that the ship ran short of provisions, and Captain Morris resolved on anchoring at Spithead on his way up Channel to obtain some meat and vegetables. Well was it that he did so, for the accident, according to all human presumption, would equally have happened had he held on his course. It would then have been the story of the *Amazon* over again—it may well be in a more appalling form. At 1.30 a.m. on Thursday, the 2nd inst., the ship brought up at Spithead, and the crew were employed, under the direction of the chief mate, in furling the sails. They were yet engaged in their task when a violent explosion was heard in the after-part of the ship. The skylights on the poop were blown out and the poop ladders were carried away. In a moment the whole decks were filled with a choking vapour, and then the flames burst out, running like wildfire along the decks. Ladies rushed on deck shrieking in their night-dresses. The officers on board sprang up as best they could. The troops leaped from their hammocks, and scarcely escaped death even then, so rapid was the progress of the flames. For a moment, and but for a moment, all was confusion and "God have mercy on our souls!" Order, however, was soon restored, so powerful were the instincts and habits of discipline even at such a time. The troops, under the orders of the officers, gathered on the fore-part of the burning ship, and never were men more self-possessed, more ready in obedience, more cheerful in the presence of impending death. The crew did their work quite as well. As soon as it became clear

that it was impossible to arrest the progress of the flames the four boats belonging to the ship were lowered down, and the women and children were passed over the sides and placed in safety. There was not room for all of them. Presently two men-of-war's boats came alongside, and the remainder of the women and children were passed down. Then, and not till then, the men began to look out for themselves, and in half an hour's time every one who could be found was got out of the ship. There must have been in all about 500 human beings on board. During this dreadful period the crew of the ship appear to have rendered little assistance; the heroic example of their officers and the military failed to restrain these base-minded fellows. But such was the fortitude, the humanity and discipline of the soldiers, that in a calamity that might have been so awful, the loss of life amounted to no more than one woman and five children, who were killed or suffocated by the first explosion; one soldier, who died from exhaustion after he was brought to shore, and one child. The prompt and effective assistance afforded by the officers in command at Portsmouth was highly praiseworthy. The disaster could not have occurred at a better spot. All the assistance the British navy could have rendered would, however, have been of little avail but for the high discipline, the ready obedience, the fortitude and self-control of the marine and military officers, and the soldiers, and the clear head and firm will of the commander.

Captain Morris did not leave his ship until the flaming mast

went by the board. Then the gun-boat *Falcon* went up to her and endeavoured to sink her by firing several shots into her, but without effect. The ship was then towed into shoal water off Haslar Hospital, where at high-tide the water covered her amidsthips; but when the tide left her, the fire spread again over the ship and cargo, the interior of the wreck appearing like a mass of molten lava.

An inquiry into the cause of the disaster resulted in the following severe decision of the Court—"That they found that the fire which caused the destruction of the ship was not caused by spontaneous combustion; that the steward had orders not to go into the store-room with a naked light; that he did do so in defiance of orders; that he used candles lit from lucifer matches when there; that he was in the store-room on the day previous to the fire, between 8 and 9 p.m., with a light; that the fire originated in the store-room or magazine; and that the fire was caused by the culpable and criminal neglect of the steward, Charles Gardner, while in the magazine the night prior to the fire; that the master and his officers did all that could be desired; that very few of the crew rendered much assistance; that the greater part of the crew behaved in a most disreputable and unseamanlike manner; that Mr. Narracott's, the chief officer, giving the key of the magazine to the steward amounted to a dereliction of duty." On the finding of the Court being read, Charles Gardner, the steward, was taken into custody on application from Captain Morris to the Court, on a charge of manslaughter. He

was tried at the Winchester Assizes; but the particular proof failed, and, the learned Judge telling the jury that they must not guess at the guilt of a man, he was acquitted.

2. EARTHQUAKE IN ASIA MINOR.

—A letter from Constantinople, dated the 15th June, says—"Erzeroum was well nigh destroyed by an earthquake on the 2nd inst. At half-past 10 o'clock a.m., apparently without any warning, and while people were engaged in their ordinary pursuits, a shock was felt, which, in the space of 15 seconds, destroyed almost every building of importance in the town; mosques, churches, barracks, prisons, khans, and bazaars, are either heaps of ruins or in such a state as to make it dangerous to approach them. After the first great commotion nothing of a serious nature had occurred up to 3 o'clock in the afternoon of the following day, when the courier left; but there had been a continuation of those vibrations which every one who has lived in countries subject to volcanic action must have experienced in a greater or less degree. Every living creature had left the town, all the inhabitants who escaped being encamped on the plain of Cavate. The loss of human life is variously estimated, the most extravagant statements prevailing; but I fear there is good reason to believe that 600 or 700 people have perished. The English, French, and Austrian Consulates have been either destroyed or rendered unfit for further occupation." Other accounts increase the number of persons buried in the ruins to 1500. The shocks continued to be felt at short intervals for some weeks, by which the town was utterly destroyed and

the people (as it is said) resolved to abandon the entire district as uninhabitable, and emigrated to the various towns upon the sea-coast.

In August an earthquake is reported to have occurred in Italy, by which the town of Norcia was destroyed, 200 persons killed and very many injured.

5. WRECK OF THE MERCHANT-SHIP "ALMA."

—The ship *Alma*, of 1187 tons, of Belfast, from Calcutta for the Mauritius, was wrecked in the river Hooghly, when numerous lives were lost, owing to a culpable neglect too common in British merchant-ships. The ship left Calcutta early on the morning of the 5th, and by 4 p.m. the same day was driven on to a bank. The sea was breaking furiously around, but there seemed no reason why the boats should not have been sufficient to save every one on board. As the ship settled down, a boat was launched, into which five men got, with directions to take off the poop the captain, his wife and child, two passengers, Lieut. Ruck and his wife, and others. The tide drove the boat against the side of the ship, and the rope was therefore cut in order that the men might row her to the point. The boat immediately drifted away, and when the men attempted to row, their efforts were useless because there were no thole-pins! Our readers may not perhaps all know what these are—they are simply small wooden or iron pegs which, being stuck in pairs into holes along the gunwale of the boat, form the centre upon which the oars work, and without which they are altogether powerless. They might, it is evident, be stowed

away in any small locker in the boat, or kept in a bag, or, simplest and best plan of all, be attached to the boat's side by pieces of string. There is no point in the discipline of merchant-ships so systematically neglected as this—there seems to be a positive prejudice against keeping the tholes in their proper place. In the instance of this boat, there were no tholes at hand, they were kept in a locker in the fore-cabin. The consequence was that this boat, which floated like a cork, and whose crew did their best with their powerless oars, never got nearer to the ship than half-a-mile. The crew of the ship then launched the jolly-boat; she had five oars; but no tholes. But although they were not where they might be expected to be, yet there were tholes where no one would have dreamt of seeking for them—one of the seamen had five or six tholes in his pocket! With these and others hastily made from the legs of a camp-stool, the men were able to ply their oars. They saw and secured the ship's long-boat, which was decked and would have saved all; but she had *neither* oars nor tholes! The ship was now settling deep into the sand, and the remainder of her crew were seen crowded together on the poop, making signals for assistance. The men say they made great exertions to get to her, but that they were prevented by the heavy surf. They saved the carpenter, who threw himself into the sea, and swam to them. The others they left to their fate and sought refuge in the light-ship. The fate of the unhappy persons left on board was terrible—they perished as it were inch by inch.

The captain and pilot and other male passengers, assisted the females and an infant into the main-top, where they sat huddled together upon the mast-head. From that, as it went under water, they went to the maintopmast-head and topgallant mast, and remained there till about half-past 9, when the topmast and they were all plunged into the waves together! Some persons were afterwards taken from the wreck; but by the accounts it would appear that the captain, his wife and child, Lieut. Ruck, his wife and servants, and fourteen of the crew were drowned, who would have been rescued by so manifest a precaution as keeping a few pieces of wood, not larger than clothes-pegs, in their proper places.

5. THE WAR IN ITALY. — BATTLE OF MAGENTA.—*Electric Telegram.*

“French Embassy, Sunday, 9 P.M. Official Despatch.

“Magenta, June 4, 11.30 P.M.

“A great victory. 5000 prisoners. The enemy has lost besides 15,000 men.”

“Novara, Saturday, June 4.

“The Emperor to the Empress.

“At 11.30 a great victory was won at the Bridge of Magenta; 5000 prisoners are taken, and 15,000 of the enemy are killed or wounded. The details will be despatched by telegraph later.”

“Paris, Sunday, June 5, 10.35 p.m.

“At 7 o'clock this evening the cannon at the Hotel des Invalides announced the victory of Magenta.

“Paris is brilliantly illuminated; but no details of the battle have as yet arrived.”

THE AUSTRIAN ACCOUNT.

"Vienna, Sunday, June 5.

"Authentic communications of the details and result of the Battle of Magenta are still expected from the Austrian headquarters. According, however, to reliable news, the head-quarters of the Austrian army have been transferred during the night from the 4th to the 5th inst. to Abbiate Grasso.

"The same news states that the combat was undecided, and that a further fight is expected."

"Paris, Saturday, June 4.

"The following official news from the French head-quarters, dated Saturday, 9.45 a.m., has been posted up in the Bourse to-day:—

"Yesterday bridges were thrown over the Ticino, and after a fight, in which the enemy suffered considerable loss, our army began to cross to the opposite bank. The enemy were compelled to retreat, leaving in our hands several pieces of cannon and a great quantity of small arms and ammunition."

6. BATTLE OF MAGENTA.

"Paris, June 6.

"The following telegram from the Emperor to the Empress has been posted up at the Bourse:—

"Head Quarters, Monday, 8 a.m.

"Milan is insurgent.

"The Austrians have evacuated the town and castle, leaving in their precipitation cannon and the treasure of the army behind them.

"We are encumbered with prisoners, and have taken 12,000 Austrian muskets."

"Paris, Monday, June 6.

"The *Moniteur* contains the following messages:—

"The Emperor to the Empress.

"Magenta, June 5.

"Yesterday our army was under orders to march on Milan, across the bridges thrown over the Ticino at Turbigo. The operation was well executed, although the enemy, who had repassed the Ticino in great force, offered a most determined resistance. The roadways were narrow, and for two hours the Imperial Guard sustained unsupported the shock of the enemy. In the meantime General M'Mahon made himself master of Magenta. After sanguinary conflicts we repulsed the enemy at every point, with loss on our side of about 2000 men placed *hors de combat*.

"The loss of the enemy is estimated at 15,000 killed and wounded. 5000 Austrian prisoners remained in our hands."

"June 5, Evening.

"Summary of the details of the battle of Magenta:—

"Austrians taken prisoners, at least 7000.

"Austrians placed *hors de combat*, 20,000.

"Three pieces of cannon and two flags captured from the enemy.

"To-day our army rests for the purpose of re-organizing itself.

"Our loss is about 3000 killed and wounded, and one cannon taken by the enemy."

THE AUSTRIAN ACCOUNT.

"Vienna, Monday, June 6, 8 a.m.

"The following official bulletins have been received here:—

"Milan, June 4, 9.30 p.m.

"The army is fighting in the neighbourhood of Milan. There

is a great movement of people in Milan.

"It is said not to be going badly with the army.

"10 p.m.

"The battle has been going on during the whole day near Magenta.

"The result is not known. There was an alarming tumult here this evening, but all is quiet now."

"Vienna, Monday, 11 a.m.

"LAST OFFICIAL NEWS.

"On the 4th only the First and Second Corps under Count Clam and Prince Lichtenstein, were engaged.

"The battle continued on the 5th.

"The result is not known."

(OFFICIAL.)

"Vienna, Monday, June 11.30 a.m.

"A desperate combat took place the day before yesterday between the First and Second (Count Clam's and Prince Edward Lichtenstein's) *Corps d'Armée* and the enemy, who had passed the Ticino with very considerable forces.

"The result of the contest was undecided.

"The combat continued yesterday, Sunday.

"Our troops threw themselves upon the enemy's ranks with ardour, and showed a valour and perseverance worthy of the most glorious feats of arms of the Imperial army.

"Milan is perfectly tranquil.

"The head-quarters yesterday were still at Abbiate Grasso."

"Verona, June, 5.

"The following is official:—

"Early yesterday a hot fight began at Magenta between the enemy, who had crossed in great force to the eastern bank of the

Ticino, and the troops of the First and Second *Corps d'Armée*.

"The conflict was maintained with varying fortune till night set in. Final details are still wanting, as the struggle for victory has been renewed to-day and still continues. Eye-witnesses report that our troops join battle with joyous shouts, and display endurance and bravery fully worthy of the most famous deeds of the Imperial army.

"The authorities and the weak garrison of Milan, with the exception of the castle garrison, have withdrawn, at the command of General Gyulai. The town is quiet.

"Further details will follow later."

8. DISTRIBUTION OF THE VICTORIA CROSS.—Her Majesty personally distributed the Victoria Cross, within the quadrangle of Buckingham Palace, to the following officers and men, whose distinguished actions will be found set forth in the APPENDIX TO THE CHRONICLE:—

Commander Thomas James Young, R.N., November, 1857; Commander Nowell Salmon; Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Henry Marshman Havelock, Bart., late 10th Foot; Major James Leith, late 14th Dragoons; Major Frederick Miller; Staff-Surgeon Anthony Dickson Home, late of the 90th Regiment; Assistant-Surgeon William Bradshaw, late of the 90th Regiment; Thomas Hancock, late private of the 9th Lancers; Lance-Corporal Abraham Boulger, 84th Regiment; Private David Mackay, 93rd Regiment; Captain Frederic Robertson Aikman, Bengal Native Infantry; Lieutenant F. S. Roberts, Bengal Artillery;

Lieutenant Hastings Edward Harington, Bengal Artillery; Lieutenant J. Watson, 28th Bombay Native Infantry; Lieutenant Thomas Adair Butler, 1st Bengal European Fusiliers.

10. THE DIVISION ON THE ADDRESS.—The division on the amendment to the Address, which led to the resignation of Lord Derby's Government, is the largest on record. In the division on the Representation of the People Bill in 1859, which led to the dissolution (beside the Speaker and the Tellers) 621 members voted—viz., Ayes, 291; Noes, 330—majority, 29. On the election of Speaker in 1835, 622 members voted—viz., for Mr. Abercrombie, 316; for Mr. Mannors Sutton, 306—majority, 10. On Sir R. Peel's motion for a vote of censure on Lord Melbourne's Administration, in 1841, 623 members voted—viz., Ayes, 312; Noes, 311—majority, 1. In the same year, on the Address, 629 members voted—viz., Ayes, 269; Noes, 360—majority, 91. On the amendment to the Address, in 1859, 633 members voted—viz., Ayes, 323; Noes, 310—majority, 13.

The analysis of the House on the last occasion is as follows:

Present:—	
For	323
Against	310
Tellers	4
Speaker	1
	<hr/>
	638
Absent	8
Pairs	6
Vacant (Aylesbury and Cork)	2
	<hr/>
Total	654

VOL. CI.

12. WRECK OF THE INDIAN MAIL-STEAMER "ALMA."—The magnificent steam-ship of the Peninsular and Oriental Company, the *Alma*, has been wrecked on a reef in the Red Sea. The *Alma* was an iron screw-steamer, of 1293 tons register, and was commanded by an officer who had made no fewer than 72 voyages in the Red Sea; the first officer had made eleven voyages in the Red Sea. There were four other officers, and a crew of 51 Europeans (chiefly engineers, stewards, &c.) and 171 Manilla men and Lascars. There were about 140 passengers, among whom was Sir John Bowring. The India and China mails were also on board, and a cargo worth 200,000*l*. There was also on board an Arab pilot, who it was stated was engaged merely for the satisfaction of the insurers, and the captain and officers never sought and habitually disregarded his advice. The ship arrived at Aden on the 10th of June, and left it on the 11th, in the morning. At this time Captain Henry was confined to his cot, by an attack of erysipelas, and Mr. Davies, the chief officer, was left in charge. At 3 A.M., of the 12th, the ship ran upon a reef, part of the desert islands called Haruish, heeled over immediately, and the star-board and stern-ports being put under water, she filled rapidly. All the females and many of the male passengers were in bed, and the suddenness of the accident, and the position of the vessel, placed them in the greatest jeopardy. Fortunately, there was no panic; the male passengers, many of whom were officers returning from India, and were sleeping on deck, displayed their

G

characteristic coolness and courage, and the European crew, when it was found that the ship could not be got off, behaved well. By their exertions the women and children were dragged from their berths, and from the cabins now filling with water, and hoisted upon the decks; but very few of them had on more than their night-clothes, and none saved any of their apparel. As soon as the ship had struck, it was found that the reef formed part of an island. To this spot the passengers were conveyed in the boats, without the loss of a single life. But their position was distressing in the extreme. The island was an uninhabited, sterile, and waterless waste. Only a small quantity of provisions, some beer and wine, and a very small quantity of water, were saved; nor was there any shelter against the terrible power of a Red Sea sun. The same courageous exertions palliated these sufferings. Shelter was formed by sails and other materials, fires were lighted, such clothes as could be got from the wreck were distributed, and by 9 o'clock the same morning, six hours after the vessel struck, a hot breakfast was set before the ladies and children. A boat was then manned, and despatched to Mocha for assistance—particularly for water—and the Turkish authorities were unusually prompt in affording aid. The boat then proceeded by sea to Aden; but fortunately, when in the narrowest part of the Straits, descried the war-steamer *Cyclops*, who took them on board and steamed instantly to the wreck. By this time the provisions and water had begun to run short; the island was surrounded by numerous

fishing-boats of the savage and piratical Arabs, and the Lascar seamen were showing symptoms of mutiny. In this gloomy state of affairs, the *Cyclops* suddenly made her appearance, and soon removed the people from the island. During the four days they had been on the reef they had been exposed to much suffering; the male passengers being more exposed and subjected to more exertion, were proportionately affected, many were struck by *coups-de-soleil*, and the purser died from the effects. The mails were saved. The wreck remained some time upon the reef, but ultimately went to pieces. The Board of Trade instituted an inquiry into the cause of the wreck. It appeared clear that the first officer had executed his duties with considerable carelessness, failing to consult the chart, and when uncertain as to the correctness of his course did not slack speed. For these reasons the blame of the misfortune was adjudged to rest on Mr. Davies, whose certificate was suspended for twelve months. The island has, it seems, a considerable elevation above the sea, and was seen by several before the ship struck; but it would seem that there was a thin stratum of haze floating at slight height, which shut it out from the men on the look-out. It is also said that the old Arab pilot warned the third officer that the ship was in a dangerous course; but that, as usual, no attention was paid to his warning.

This was not the sole misfortune of this enterprising, well-managed Company this season. On the 20th August, the *Northam* was wrecked on a reef near Jed-

dah. All the passengers and the letter portion of the mails were saved.

12. GREAT FIRE AT PERTH.—A fire, almost large enough to be called a conflagration, has occurred at Perth. It broke out originally among a quantity of dry sawn timber piled on the premises of Mr. A. Robertson, a cabinet-maker of Union Street, and was first observed at a little after seven o'clock, P.M., making itself manifest by volumes of smoke. Fire-engines were soon obtained, but water was scarce, and the materials on the spot were of the most combustible nature. Another timber-yard close by, belonging to Mr. J. Smiles, soon caught fire, and helped to spread the disaster. In one building after another the flames burst out; and nearly the whole south side of Union Street, and almost the whole of Kinnoull Street, were eventually destroyed. The fears of all present were greatly enhanced, when the fire was at its height, by a rumour that the New Gas Company's works had caught fire. The dread of an explosion sent hundreds away to distant parts of the town; but nothing of the kind happened. Some barrels of tar and butter, however, in one of the timber-yards, added in no small degree to the splendour of the spectacle. The loss is estimated at about 6000*l*.

14. ASCOT RACES.—The fine weather and excellent sport, aided by the presence of Her Majesty on the great day, rendered the Ascot Meeting of this year a very successful event. On Tuesday Her Majesty's Vase was won by Mr. W. Day's "Schism," the Ascot Stakes by Mr. C. Ber-

nard's "Rouble." On Wednesday "Schism" and Colonel Pearson's "King-at-Arms" ran a dead heat for the Royal Hunt Cup, which "King-at-Arms" carried off in the deciding heat. 35 horses started. On Thursday Her Majesty, accompanied by the Prince Consort and the Princesses, witnessed the sport. The Gold Cup produced another dead heat between Mr. W. Day's "Fisherman" and Mr. Merry's "Saunterer." The deciding heat was won by "Fisherman," who thereby carried off the Cup for the second year in succession.

15. FATAL BOAT ACCIDENT IN THE BRISTOL CHANNEL.—A party of Whitsuntide excursionists have met with a fatal accident. The steamer *Neath Abbey* was advertised to start on an "Excursion" from Bristol to Watchet and Minehead, Whit Monday, to return on the following day. About 300 persons accordingly embarked. A considerable number were landed at Watchet, the others at Minehead. The next morning the steamer picked up her passengers at the latter place, and then returned to Watchet to take up those she had landed there. The boats provided for the purpose of conveying them from the shore to the vessel were insufficient for the impatient passengers, and many got into other small boats belonging to the place. Twelve or more crowded into a small boat, which was rowed by two men to the steamer, which lay half a mile off. The boat was loaded to the water's edge, and in consequence a swell of the sea swept over the gunwale, and she instantly sank. Another small boat had met with a similar disaster when nearer to

the steamer, and her case being perceived the steamer's boat pushed off, and her passengers were saved. When the accident to the former boat was observed, boats instantly rowed from the shore, who succeeded in picking up eight of the unfortunate excursionists, but one of these died from fright and exhaustion, and some six were drowned.

15. DOUBLE MURDER AND SUICIDE IN ST. PANCRAS.—A working jeweller, named Cruft, and his wife, lodged at 52, Swinton Street, St. Pancras. The wife had recently been confined with her second child; since which she had been in a desponding state under the idea that she would not be able to provide for them. There was no foundation for this idea, for the husband was a steady man, and had regular employment. In the morning of this day the husband went to his usual occupation. About 11 o'clock the poor woman sent out her servant-girl upon an errand. When the girl returned she could not gain admission; and circumstances having occasioned alarm, the police were called and broke into the apartments. A most frightful sight presented itself. On a French bedstead lay the lifeless bodies of Mrs. Cruft and her two children, the blood still warm and oozing from their wounds. The children were both girls—one aged three years, the other about two months old. Both their throats were cut from ear to ear. The children were in their night-clothes, the mother fully dressed, and her clothes saturated with blood. The razor with which she committed the act was found between her feet. From the evidence given at the

inquest, it would appear that the poor mother was unable to suckle her infant, and was labouring under many of those symptoms of insanity which are frequently found under such circumstances.

16. THE TWO NEW MARSHALS OF FRANCE.—The following is the history of the two distinguished French Generals, who have been raised to the rank of Marshals of France for their distinguished conduct at the battle of Magenta:—

"Count de M'Mahon (Marie-Patrice-Maurice), was born about 1807, at the château of Sully, in the arrondissement of Autun. He is descended from an Irish family, which, after living with distinction for many centuries in Ireland, risked all for the last of the Stuart kings. The M'Mahons, carrying their national traditions and historic name to France, mingled their blood by marriage with the old nobility of their adopted country, and obtained, with the hand of an heiress, the magnificent castle and extensive estates of Sully. The present General's father, the Count de M'Mahon, a Peer of France, a Grand Cross of the Order of St. Louis, and a personal friend of Charles X., espoused a lady of the ducal house of Caraman, and left four sons and four daughters; of the sons the youngest is the hero of Malakoff and of Magenta. He was educated at the military school at St. Cyr, on leaving which, in 1825, he entered the French military service, and in 1830 joined the army of Algeria, where he soon distinguished himself alike by his gallantry and his intelligence. After the combat of the Col de Terchia, in which he was aide-de-camp to

General Achard, the latter said to him, 'Can you carry to Colonel Ruillières, at Blidah, the order to change his march? As the mission is dangerous, I will give you a squadron of light dragoons as an escort.' The young officer refused the escort, declaring that it was either too little or too much, and preferred going alone. On arriving at about half a mile from Blidah he saw groups of the enemy's horsemen on each side, as well as behind him; but he went firmly on, knowing that a deep precipice, called the Ravine of Blidah, was a little way in front of him. He there drove his horse, a high-blooded animal, at the tremendous chasm, and the animal, without hesitation, sprang into mid-air. The rider held his seat immovably and escaped unhurt, but was obliged to abandon his charger, which had its fore-legs broken. Not one of the Arabs ventured to take the desperate leap, and the young officer reached Blidah in safety. He rose rapidly through the different grades, and attained that of General of Brigade in 1848. For a time he occupied the position of Governor of the province of Oran, and afterwards of Constantina, and in 1852 became General of Division. In 1855, when General Canrobert left the Crimea, General M'Mahon was selected by the Emperor to succeed him in the command of a division; and when the chiefs of the allied armies resolved on assaulting Sebastopol, he had assigned to him the honourable and perilous post of carrying the works of the Malakoff. The manner in which he performed that duty is too fresh in the memory of our readers to need

mention, and his able conduct at the battle of Magenta has now raised him to the highest rank in the army. The Marshal married, in 1854, Mademoiselle Elizabeth de Castries, daughter of the Marquis de Castries, and has by her a son born in 1855."

"Count Regnault de Saint Jean d'Angely, commanding in chief of the Imperial Guard, is the son of a distinguished officer of the First empire. He commenced his military career under that Empire as sub-lieutenant of the 8th Regiment of Hussars. In that regiment he made the campaign of Russia, and was at the battle of Leipzig. Both in the retreat from Russia and in the battle his regiment suffered severely, and it was by a sort of miracle that he escaped. In 1814 he was attached to the Imperial staff, and was made a captain by the Emperor, for having distinguished himself in presence of His Majesty before Rheims. On the return of Napoleon from the Isle of Elba he was nominated one of His Majesty's orderly-officers, and he displayed such marked bravery at the battle of Waterloo that he was made a Chef d'Escadron on the field. After the downfall of Napoleon he was struck out of the army list, but he joined Colonel Fabvier in his expedition to Greece. In 1830 he was restored to his grade of Chef d'Escadron, and was in 1832 appointed colonel of the 1st Regiment of Lancers. In 1840 he was made Major-General, and in 1848 General of Division. In the revolution of 1848 he commanded a brigade of cavalry; and Marshal Bugeaud declared of him that he stood by the king to the last. In 1849 he

commanded the troops forming the expedition to Rome. Having been elected deputy of the *Charente-Inférieure*, he joined the party of the emperor. In 1851 he was for a short time Minister of War. In 1854 he assisted to organize the Imperial Guard, and was appointed to the command of it. He accompanied it to the Crimea. His conduct at Magenta was so distinguished as to procure for him the high honour of being named marshal."

16. WIFE MURDER.—At the Central Criminal Court, William Adams, 35, shoemaker, was indicted for the wilful murder of Martha Christmas Page. The prisoner was a shoemaker, and when sober, a hard-working man; but he was given to drink, and when excited, violent and jealous of his wife. About six weeks ago the wife left her husband on account of his violence, and concealed her new place of residence. The prisoner on this worked himself up to a pitch of frenzy, accused his wife of having left him to lead a profligate life, and threatened her relatives for concealing her. The deceased, who was about 25 years of age, was the wife's sister. She lived as servant with a family in Kingsland. There were staying in the house a lady and her daughter, who, being desirous of visiting the Abney Park Cemetery, obtained permission that the deceased should go with them to guide them. Just before starting there was a knock at the door, which was opened by the deceased; the prisoner was the person who had knocked. A conversation followed, of which nothing is known. When the ladies issued forth, accompanied by the deceased, the prisoner

was still hanging about, and shortly came up to the deceased and said, "Will you tell me where she is?" The deceased answered, "No; I will not." The prisoner immediately drew out a shoemaker's knife and stabbed her thrice. One only of the blows reached her person, and this inflicted a wound on the groin, of which she subsequently died in the German Hospital, Dalston.

Evidence was given of the violent threats the prisoner had used against the deceased, that on the morning of the murder, he was very excited on the subject, and spent some time in sharpening a knife, saying that he would go and look for his wife, and if he found her he would lay her a corpse. His landlady stated that at this time he was perfectly sober.

The jury found the prisoner guilty, and he was sentenced to be hanged, and was executed.

17. THE RELIGIOUS STATE SERVICES.—Several of the occasional and commemorative services contained in the Book of Common Prayer having fallen into desuetude, by reason of their utter inappropriateness to the present times, Her Majesty has been pleased to issue the following warrant under her royal sign-manual, directing the same to be discontinued :—

"VICTORIA R.

"Whereas, by our Royal Warrant of the 21st day of June, 1837, in the first year of our reign, we commanded that certain forms of prayer and service, made for the 5th of November, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May, should be forthwith printed and published, and annexed to

the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, to be used yearly on the said days, in all cathedrals and collegiate churches and chapels, in all chapels of colleges and halls within our Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, and of our Colleges of Eton and Winchester, and in all parish churches and chapels within those parts of our United Kingdom called England and Ireland.

"And whereas in the last session of Parliament addresses were presented to us by both Houses of Parliament, praying us to take into consideration our Proclamation in relation to the said forms of prayer and service made for the 5th day of November, the 30th day of January, and the 29th day of May, with a view to their discontinuance.

"And whereas we have taken into our consideration the subject of the said addresses, and after due deliberation we have resolved that the use of the said forms of prayer and service shall be discontinued.

"Now, therefore, our will and pleasure is, that so much of our said Royal Warrant of the 21st day of June, 1837, in the first year of our reign, as is hereinbefore recited, be revoked, and that the use of the said forms of prayer and service made for the 5th of November, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May be henceforth discontinued in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, in all chapels of colleges and halls within our Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, and of our Colleges of Eton and Winchester, and in all parish churches and

chapels within the parts of our United Kingdom called England and Ireland, and that the said form of prayer and service be not henceforth printed and published with, or annexed to, the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland.

"Given at our Court at St. James's the 17th of January, 1859, in the 22nd year of our reign.

"By Her Majesty's command,
"S. H. WALPOLE."

20. THE HANDEL FESTIVAL.—The preliminary Festival in 1857 and the grand Rehearsal, commemorated in the last volume of the ANNUAL REGISTER, having established these important points,—the deep interest taken by the English people in the works of the Great Master, the existence of a body of musicians competent to execute his greatest works upon the grandest conceivable scale; and the capacity of the Crystal Palace as a music-hall, to give the fullest and most perfect scope to their powers,—the Committee proceeded to arrange all the details necessary for so difficult and delicate an undertaking. For the purposes of the Festival the central transept had been converted into a vast music-hall, 360 feet long, by 216 wide, containing an area of 77,000 square feet, exclusive of the increased auditorial space gained by the several tiers of galleries. As it was remarked that on the former occasions the large body of performers did not produce the overpowering mass of sound anticipated, and that notwithstanding the unparalleled grandeur of the choruses, the voices did not completely fill the

area of the great transept, the Committee made arrangements both for increasing and throwing forward the volume of sound. The orchestra was increased by extensive lateral additions, the whole was enclosed, and a roof or *velarium*, on acoustic principles, was thrown over it. The choruses and instruments were also increased in carefully studied proportions. The chorus was augmented to 2765, and the band to 393,—in all 3158 performers,—selected by the Sacred Harmonic Society. From the works of a composer as abundant as his genius was pre-eminent, the task of selecting those pieces which were to be considered as the adequate examples of his powers was not easy. Fortunately among those universally admitted to be his greatest, the *Messiah* is deeply rooted in the affection of the English; this, therefore, was adopted for the opening performance. The *Israelites in Egypt* holds an almost equal place, and is, moreover, peculiarly calculated for the special nature of the circumstances. The grand choruses admitted of indefinite masses of voices, and their volume would fill an area in which solos and concerted pieces—especially, when of a soft or plaintive character—would be lost. This grand oratorio was, therefore, chosen for the final performance. It was judiciously determined by the managers, that the performances of the second day should consist of a selection from others of Handel's grandest works, which, from their broad and effective character, should impress upon the auditors the greatness and majesty of Handel's intellect. The pieces chosen were the *Det-*

tingen Te Deum, and selections from *Saul*, *Samson*, *Belshazzar* and *Judas Maccabæus*. It was further arranged that after each day's performance the wind-bands should execute in the grounds marches, minuets, the "Water Music" and "Firework Music" and other compositions of the Great Master.

It is unnecessary to detail the arrangements made by the managers for the accommodation of the audience, further than to state that in a court of the Palace was a collection of Handel Relics—such as the autograph scores of the *Messiah*, the *Israelites in Egypt*, the *Te Deum*, *Acis and Galatea*, and numerous letters, portraits and personal ornaments of the composer, his harpsicord, and Roubiliac's statue.

In preparation for this occasion the great musical associations in London and the provinces, from whose members the intended executants had been selected, had diligently practised the pieces; and having then been collected in London, were massed in large bodies; and lastly, a full rehearsal was held on the preceding Saturday in the Crystal Palace itself. To this the general public were admitted by tickets or by payment. Nearly 20,000 persons were present, and the reports they made of the grandeur and efficiency of the whole performances, gave a great stimulus to the attendance on the arranged days of the Festival. It would be useless to attempt to describe what is in its nature incommunicable by description—the manner, and effect of the execution of the separate pieces. It must suffice to mention that Madame Clara Novello, Madame

Rudersdorff, Miss Dolby, Madame L. Sherrington, Mr. Sims Reeves, Mr. Weiss, and Signor Belletti, were the principal solo-singers, and executed their several parts in the most admirable manner. On Monday, the performance of the *Messiah*, with its pathetic solos and concerted pieces, and its occasional bursts of grand choruses, produced a most favourable impression: this divine composition had certainly never before been heard in such completeness, or in a manner so perfectly conveying the exquisite pathos, the devotional purity and lofty aspiration of those passages descriptive of the birth and mission of the Redeemer, his suffering and resurrection; nor have the exultant choruses in which the faithful hail his advent and triumph, or in which the persecutors vent their rage, been before so adequately rendered. The performance of Wednesday, grand as the pieces chosen are individually, and nobly as they were rendered, wanted the proportion and coherence to be found in a dramatic history, and in this sense, by their want of intellectual unity, failed of much of the impressiveness of Monday's oratorio. These observations, however, scarcely apply to the *Dettingen Te Deum*, which being a grand whole, and grandly rendered, produced a sustained impression. Of late years this magnificent composition has been rarely performed; but single pieces are familiar favourites—such as the semi-chorus, "To thee all Angels cry aloud," and "To thee Cherubim and Seraphim continually do cry." The fragmentary character of the remainder of the programme—if

it disappointed the more instructed portion of the audience—on the other hand, constantly rivetted attention afresh by the novelty of each succeeding part; and as each piece was selected for its marked individuality, the audience seemed to bring away a more distinct impression of the airs than of those which, forming part of a great whole, are led into by compositions from which they naturally flow, and are followed by pieces which they suggest. *Belshazzar* is perhaps the weakest of Handel's oratorios; nor did the two pieces selected, "Rejoice, my countrymen," and "Sing, O ye heavens," do much to raise its reputation. On the other hand, the selections from *Saul* gave great delight—so popular, indeed, were the pieces, that the audience twice departed from the staid decorum of the occasion and unanimously demanded the repetition of the remarkable chorus, "Envy, eldest born of hell," which was sung with singular spirit and precision; and the famous "Dead March," which was rendered with exquisite delicacy and solemnity. Among the pieces taken from *Samson* was the popular "Let the bright Seraphim," which offered opportunity for a splendid triumph to Madame Novello and to Mr. Harper. It was redemanded with enthusiasm. *Judas Maccabæus* also gave to Mr. Sims Reeves the occasion for a display of his dramatic power in "Sound an alarm:" the warrior-like tone of excitement about the air was rendered with electrical effect; and when followed by the rapid chorus, "We hear, we hear," a more vivid picture of a people hurriedly called to battle

can scarcely be imagined. These two pieces deserved and obtained a repetition. The selection concluded with the favourite, "See the conquering Hero comes," the beauty and spirit of which, often as it has been repeated, seemed to strike the audience with the surprise of novelty. Unquestionably the performance of the *Israelites in Egypt* on Friday was unequalled. The result proved how peculiarly it was fitted for such an occasion. It consists of a series of choruses, in which the composer has exhausted all the resources of his art in painting, by vast combinations of sound, some of the most terrible phenomena of nature—the devastating hail, the fire from heaven running along the ground, the thick darkness which covered the earth, and the host of Pharaoh swallowed up by the stormy billows of the Red Sea. Such being Handel's design, he has allowed small scope for the prettinesses of individual singing. The airs are few, and form a comparatively slight feature of the work. This defect, as it was long regarded, has been, even down to our own day, injurious to the success of *Israel in Egypt*. In the space of twenty years Handel could scarcely obtain for it half-a-dozen performances, which were given to empty houses, though the composer was fain to tempt the public by interlarding his own gigantic choruses with Italian opera songs! Even in modern times, with more reverence for the Master than he paid to himself, it has been thought expedient to relieve its supposed "heaviness" by songs selected with more or less judgment from his other works. The performance at this

Festival proved that when the arrangements are equal to the greatness of the subject, Handel's conceptions were as just as they are gigantic. The effect of the choruses was sometimes stupendous, giving an impression of awful and resistless power. Such was the feeling excited by the "Hailstone chorus," "He rebuked the Red Sea," "The waters overwhelmed their enemies," and "The horse and his rider hath he cast into the sea." And the utterance of the words, "Sing ye unto the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously," first by the single voice of Miriam the Prophetess, and then by the chorus, was like the joyful acclaim of a whole people. In this passage Clara Novello gained a great triumph. Her clear and brilliant notes, ringing through the vast expanse, and filling every heart with sympathetic emotion, were a marvellous effort of vocal power.

On an occasion which demands the most consummate musical knowledge and taste, the most perfect appreciation of the design and mind of the composer, great power of command, and great temper and tact, it would be unjust to M. Costa to omit his name as the conductor of these, the greatest musical performances that have hitherto been known. The opportunity was the greatest that has ever presented itself to a musician, and M. Costa showed himself fully equal to his duties.

In a popular point of view the Festival was fully successful. At the Rehearsal there were present 19,680 persons; on Monday 17,109; on Wednesday 18,000; on Friday (owing to a kindly ex-

tension of cheap single tickets to seats outside the transepts), 26,826—in all 81,615 persons. In a pecuniary sense likewise the success was very great; the receipts of the three days were upwards of 33,000*l.*; the expenses 18,000*l.*

22. POLITICAL KIDNAPPING.—

An extraordinary charge was preferred at the Liverpool Police Court against William Leslie, master of the British ship *Louisa Bragington*. The information charged the defendant with assault on and false imprisonment of four Chilean gentlemen, under the extraordinary circumstances detailed in the evidence of Don Benjamin McKenna, one of the sufferers. This gentleman, who spoke English well, deposed that he was a Chilean by birth, and was till recently one of the editors and proprietors of a newspaper published at Santiago, the seat of government for Chili. In December last a meeting of the inhabitants was held for the purpose of obtaining a reformed government. He, and the gentlemen with him, besides others, were surrounded by troops on the same day and taken to prison. Two of them—namely, Messrs. Antonio Matta and Angel Custodio Gallo, were members of the House of Representatives, which consists of 60 members. They were kept in prison at Santiago for three months, which ended on the 8th of March, on which day they were taken to Valparaiso, a distance of 90 miles, in a close carriage, surrounded by soldiers. On arriving at the wharf at Valparaiso they found a number of troops waiting their arrival, and they were taken on board the *Louisa Bragington* in

armed boats. Two soldiers and the chief officer were on board waiting to receive them, and the latter pointed them out to the defendant, mentioning their names. A Chilean war steamer escorted the vessel out to sea for 10 or 12 miles, and when she left they called the captain into the cabin where they were. Witness told him he had no right to take them as prisoners to England, and requested that he would land them at Arica, a Peruvian port which was at hand. This he refused to do, stating that he had entered into a contract with the Chilean Government for 3000 dollars to land them in Liverpool, and there place them in the charge of the Chilean Consul, under a penalty of 1500 dollars. They offered to pay him both those sums to land them at some port on the Peruvian coast; but the captain said he would adhere to his contract, and that he would take the President of Chili himself and land him at Cape Horn if he got paid for it. On approaching the Azores the captain became apprehensive that they would attempt to land, and therefore ordered holes to be bored in the boats, and distributed loaded arms to the crew. They landed on the 15th inst. at Liverpool, after a passage of 98 days, and immediately sought professional assistance for making their grievances known. The defendant pleaded guilty, and wished to have the matter treated summarily; but the magistrate, Mr. Mansfield, on the ground that important questions of international law were involved, refused, and sent the case for trial, in order that the law might be ulti-

mately decided by a competent tribunal.

The final judgment of the Court for the consideration of Crown Cases Reserved was, that an English vessel in the waters of a foreign country was subject to the laws of that country; and the master of the *Louisa Bragington* could, therefore, justify all that he had done during the time he was within the Chilian territory. But when the ship was out of the foreign territory she was subject to the laws of England and amenable to English law. Although, then, the master was justified in receiving these prisoners in Chili without their consent, that justification ceased as soon as he had left the Chilian waters. The Court, therefore, affirmed the conviction.

23. ACCIDENT TO A MAN-OF-WAR'S BOAT. — *Sixteen persons drowned.* A fatal accident has occurred in Belfast harbour. In the afternoon a man-of-war's boat was conveying from a wharf a draught of recruits for the navy, amounting to sixteen, consisting altogether of landsmen. These were escorted by the boat's crew of the ship, making in all nineteen persons. The tender to which the recruits were to be conveyed was anchored in the Whitehouse-roads, about 3 miles from the quays of Belfast. Unfortunately, the boat never reached her destination. Through some mischance she capsized, and thirteen out of the nineteen on board perished. The remaining six were saved by the boat of a pilot-cutter which was fortunately at hand.

24. SUICIDE OF TWO LOVERS. — The little watering-place of Aldborough, on the Yorkshire

coast, has been the scene of a painful event. A youth and maiden, neither more than 18 years of age, formed an attachment which was discountenanced by the youth's relatives. On the evening of the 24th inst., the lovers went out together, and appear to have walked about to a late hour. On the following morning, as an old man was proceeding to the sea-side to follow his avocation of getting gravel and cobbles, his attention was arrested by finding sundry articles of female apparel laid on the sand, out of reach of the tide. These articles included a mantle, a couple of skirts, and a crinoline. His suspicions were aroused, and on looking about he saw the bodies of two persons in the water, about 100 yards distant. They were being dashed about by the receding tide, in what is locally called the "Group," that is to say, between the two sand-banks occasioned by the action of the sea. Unable to remove them he went for assistance, and then the bodies were drawn to land, and proved to be the two young persons referred to. They had effected their purpose of dying together in a very resolute manner, for their corpses were found to be tied together by the necks, around which the girl's handkerchief had been firmly twisted.

25. SALES OF PICTURES. — The ordinary course of events has brought to the hammer several fine collections of paintings, which contained remarkable examples of art. Beside Lord Northwick's grand galleries, of which an account is given elsewhere, the private collection of the late Hon. Edmund Phipps yielded some

beautiful paintings: as a cabinet Teniers, a female head, 115 gs.; two fine Canaletti, 291 gs. Watteau, a Conversational Champêtre, 100 gs. P. de Hooghe, "Interior of an Apartment," 169 gs. Vander Neer, "A River Scene," 200 gs.; Jan Steen, "Music Lesson," 215 gs. Teniers, "Interior of a Picture Gallery," 260 gs. Wilkie, "Sportsmen Reposing," 383 gs. Collins, "The Boat-builders," 220 gs. Landseer, "A Highlander and his Daughter," 815 gs. Do. "Count D'Orsay's Dog," 505 gs. Sir J. Reynolds, "Portrait of Mrs. Nesbitt," 600 gs. This beautiful private cabinet produced 9225*l*.

At a sale of pictures from several private cabinets, but chiefly from that of Mr. Windus, a portrait of "Penelope Boothby," by Sir Joshua Reynolds was sold for 1100 gs.; a portrait of Mrs. Hoare, also by Sir Joshua, produced the astonishing sum of 2250 gs. "The Morning Walk," by Gainsborough, brought 720 gs.

At a sale of the pictures of Mr. Todd, of Aberdeen, there were sold some beautiful English works. As, "Dutch boats running into Saardam," by Stanfield, 505 gs. "The Nearest Way in Summer," by Creswick and Ansdell, 500 gs. "A Landscape" by Gainsborough 570 gs.

At a miscellaneous sale by Messrs. Christie and Manson, a portrait of "Miss Rudge" by Sir Joshua Reynolds brought 500 gs.; one of "Miss Gwatkin," Sir Joshua's niece, 200 gs. "The Braddyl Family," by Sir Joshua, 1000*l*.

25. THE WAR IN ITALY. — BATTLE OF SOLFERINO. — *Electric Telegrams.* — (Received June 25, 8.30 A.M.)

"Paris, Saturday, 7.45 A.M.

"The Emperor to the Empress.

"Cavriana, Friday Evening.

"Great Battle—Great Victory.

"The whole Austrian army formed the line of battle, which extended five leagues in length. We have taken all their positions, and captured many cannon, flags, and prisoners. The battle lasted from 4 o'clock in the morning till 8 o'clock in the evening."

"Paris, Sunday, June 26.

"The *Moniteur* of this day contains the following telegram:—

"The Emperor to the Empress.

"Cavriana, Saturday, 1.30 P.M.

"It is impossible to obtain details of the battle of yesterday. The enemy withdrew last night. I have passed the night in the room occupied on the morning of the battle by the Emperor of Austria. General Niel has been appointed Marshal of France."

"The *Moniteur* also announces that yesterday the public buildings in Paris were ornamented, and a great number of houses illuminated."

"Paris, Sunday, June 26.

"A supplement to the *Moniteur*, published this evening, contains a telegram dated—

"Cavriana, June 26, 11.30 A.M.

"The Austrians, who had crossed the Mincio for the purpose of attacking us with their whole army, have been compelled to abandon their positions, and to withdrew to the left bank of the river Mincio. They have blown up the bridge of Goito. The loss of the enemy has been very considerable, but our loss is much less. We have taken 30 cannons, more than 7000 prisoners, and three flags. General Niel and his *corps d'armée* have covered

themselves with glory, as well as the whole army. General Auger has had an arm carried off. The Sardinian army inflicted considerable loss on the enemy, after having contended with great fury against superior force."

"The *Moniteur* adds that the battle of the 24th of June is to bear the name of "the Battle of Solferino."

THE AUSTRIAN ACCOUNT.

"Vienna, Saturday Morning.

"A battle on the Mincio began yesterday at 4 in the morning. At 6 the cannonade was heard distinctly at Verona. No official report has yet been received here."

"Verona, June 25 (*vid* Vienna).

"The day before yesterday our right wing occupied Pozzolengo, Solferino, and Cavriana, and the left wing pressed forward yesterday as far as Guidizzolo and Castelfreddo, driving back the enemy. The collision of the two entire armies took place yesterday at 10 a.m. Our left wing, under General Wimpffen, advanced nearly as far as the Chiese. In the afternoon a concentrated assault of the enemy was made upon the heroically defended town of Solferino. Our right wing repulsed the Piedmontese; but, on the other hand, the order of our centre could not be restored. Losses extraordinarily heavy, a violent thunderstorm, the development of powerful masses of the enemy against our left wing, and the advance of his main body against Volta, caused our retreat, which began late in the evening.

"(The above is official.)"

26. DESTRUCTION OF THE READING STATION,—At an early hour in

the morning, the station of the South-Western Railway was destroyed by fire. The station was an entirely wooden structure, containing booking-office, first and second class waiting-rooms, superintendent's office, &c. Adjoining was a covered platform, about 100 feet in length, and from it all the trains were despatched for London. A lamp-room was erected at the extreme end of the platform, and in this place the fire appears to have originated. From this room the flames spread rapidly along the covered platform and gained the booking-office, which was completely destroyed. The burning timbers fell upon the stabling, which contained about fifteen horses. These animals were with difficulty withdrawn from the burning building. Excepting an extension of the platform, and some cottages occupied by the Company's servants, the whole station was consumed. When the fire had burnt itself out, the iron chest containing some account-books and money was got out. The coin was quite safe though discoloured, but a bag containing bank-notes was so scorched and shrivelled by the heat, as to have become an undistinguishable mass. A valuable book of accounts was saved by the station-master. The book-stall, with stock valued at £200, belonging to Messrs. Smith, was destroyed.

28. WRECK OF THE "ARGO."—The enterprise of the Irish merchants has succeeded in establishing a line of fine steam vessels, to carry mails between Galway and New York, aided by a subvention granted by the Derby Administration. Unfortunately,

their earliest efforts were thwarted by the wreck of one of their finest vessels, the *Argo*, near Trepassey Bay, Cape Race. The *Argo*, which was of more than 2000 tons burden, carried 210 passengers of all classes. About 5.30 A.M. the ship was enveloped in a dense fog, but fell in with a fishing-boat, whose crew gave them information as to their precise position. This was a most fortunate circumstance, for had she stood on a few minutes longer at full speed she would have run upon a lofty cliff, and probably all on board would have perished. The captain altered his course, but did not slack his speed, and in another half-hour ran his ship upon a reef. The boats were got safely into the water, and conveyed the passengers to a cove about a mile off, without any loss of life, although they endured great hardships. In the afternoon the ship fell over, filled, and finally became a total wreck. The captain's certificate was suspended for nine months.

30. WRECK OF THE "PARAMATTA."—The Royal West India and Pacific Mail Company have lost their fine new steamer *Paramatta*, on the Anegada Reef, near St. Thomas's. The ship was only completed a few months since by the Thames Iron Ship-building Company, at a cost of 160,000*l*. She was of 3092 tons burden (builder's measurement), and 600 horse-power (nominal), and was thought to be a remarkably fast vessel. She left Southampton, on her first voyage, on the 17th instant, with the mails and about 60 passengers, under the command of Captain Baynton, one of the most skilful commanders in the Company's ser-

vice. She made a rapid passage out; but when within 50 miles of St. Thomas's she ran on the Horse Shoe Reef, part of the Anagada Rocks, and stuck fast. As the weather was fine, a boat was despatched to St. Thomas's for assistance. Every vessel at the agent's disposal was immediately sent. The passengers, mails, and cargo, were safely removed; but no efforts could avail to move the ship. She remained on the rocks unbroken for weeks, her captain and wreckers remaining in her, or in another vessel at hand, using every appliance that skill and science could suggest to get her off. The hull was finally abandoned. The inquiry directed by the Board of Trade, resulted in imputing the entire blame of this misfortune to Captain Baynton. In his desire to effect a rapid passage he had neglected the positive instructions of the Company, and had even passed over the warnings which his own observations had given him. He had ascertained, by scientific observation, that he was *not* where he had reckoned himself to be, and *therefore* pushed on at $12\frac{1}{2}$ knots an hour, until he landed his ship on a well-known reef. His certificate was suspended for twelve months.

THE WEATHER.—The weather of the spring quarter, according to the return of the Registrar-General, presented very great inequalities, being at the beginning of April considerably in excess of the average—on the 6th and 7th as much as 16° and $17\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ *plus*; but from the 8th April to the 23rd May, the balance went much to the other side. The cold of this period, succeeding to the excessive warmth of the pre-

ceding days, had a most deteriorative effect on the fruit-harvest. June again was a hot month. By these alternations the temperature of the quarter was brought to about the average. The fall of rain was about the average. The prices of provisions were somewhat higher than in the winter quarter, the average price of wheat being 47s. 8d. a quarter; of potatoes, 97s. 6d. a ton. The rate of mortality during the three months was somewhat less than the average, and the number of marriages again considerably greater. Another practical test of the general well-being of the population is to be found in the diminution of the number of paupers claiming relief in the spring quarter from 871,512 to 819,560, or 6 per cent.

JULY.

2. THUNDERSTORM.—About 10 o'clock on Saturday night, a very destructive storm burst over London and its suburbs. The thunder and lightning were very severe, and the rain fell in such torrents that great mischief was done, not only in the low-lying quarters of London, but in the open country around, for the ordinary inclosures of gardens and yards acted as retaining reservoirs, and the river Wandle burst its banks. The loss to the market-gardeners was very serious. Very many accidents occurred by the horses in different vehicles being terrified by the flashes. A woman was struck down near Newington Church;

a watchman on a barge was also struck and the barge injured. In the Kennington Road three men had taken refuge under a tree—a flash of lightning struck and destroyed the tree, and two of the men were hurled insensible to the ground. On Ditton Common, several sheep were killed by the lightning, and others near Esher and Claremont. The lightning shattered a large elm tree, near the cavalry barracks in Hyde Park, and in the morning, the carcasses of fourteen sheep were found beneath it; and sixteen sheep were found dead under a shattered tree in Kensington Gardens. Some cattle were also reported to have been killed in the Hackney Marshes. The damage done to conservatories, greenhouses, and flower-gardens by the hail was very considerable.

On the same evening, a heavy storm passed over Portsmouth and its neighbourhood; the streets and roads were inundated; the lightning was intense, and the hailstones “as large as marbles.”

On the next morning (Sunday), Chatham and Rochester experienced the visitation in the same form, tremendous thunder and lightning, and heavy rain—more like a storm of the tropics than those usually experienced in these latitudes.

2. GREAT FIRE IN BELFAST.—A destructive fire broke out in a yarn and corn depôt, behind the handsome buildings known as the Victoria chambers, Victoria Street, Belfast. The flames spread with great rapidity and soon extended to the Chambers. The fire-engines, assisted by a party of military, made great exertions, but without effect, and

these valuable buildings were totally destroyed. They were occupied by numerous firms, who apparently had large stocks upon the premises, for the *Northern Whig* estimates the value of the buildings and property destroyed at 100,000*l*.

On September 13, the extensive printworks of Messrs. Howey and Co., at Old Park, took fire, and were totally destroyed. The damage was estimated at 25,000*l*.

7. THE WAR IN ITALY. THE ARMISTICE. — *Electric Telegram*.

“Paris, Thursday Evening.

“An armistice has been agreed upon between the Emperor of Austria and the Emperor of the French.

“Commissioners are about to be named to settle the duration and clauses of the armistice.”

This most unexpected intelligence produced a most favourable impression on the money market, and caused an immediate advance in the English funds of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; Consols having risen from $93\frac{1}{2}$ to 95. Nor was this confidence misplaced, for stock maintained a continued progression. In foreign stocks the rise was proportionate to the late fall. French Rentes sprung at once $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Austrian stock, such had been the previous depression, fluctuated between 10 and 12 per cent. in advance of previous transactions.

9. SLAVE PROPERTY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES. — The judgment this day given by the Court of Common Pleas in the cause of *Santos v. Illidge*, decides a point of considerable importance to those English companies or individuals who hold slave property in foreign countries. The plain-

tiff is a Brazilian, and the defendants are British subjects domiciled in Great Britain, and members of the Imperial Brazilian Mining Association. In the year 1824 an Act (the 5th George IV., cap. 113) was passed to amend and consolidate the laws relating to the Slave Trade. By this Act contracts made by British subjects under certain circumstances for the purchase or sale of slaves are made unlawful, and no action can be maintained upon them. But as at this time slavery had not been abolished, and as British subjects in the West Indies bought and sold slaves with impunity, it was thought that the Act only applied to persons domiciled in the United Kingdom, and to contracts entered into within the limits of these islands. However that may be, the Imperial Brazilian Mining Association was established subsequently to the passing of the Act, purchased slaves in Brazil for the purpose of being used and employed in that empire, and retained those slaves and their offspring as property. Some time since the company got into Chancery, and the Lords Justices made an order that the company's property in Brazil, including the negroes, should be sold. The plaintiff, Santos, a Brazilian, contracted with the defendants for the purchase of some or all of the slaves; but subsequently the defendants seem to have taken into consideration the doubtful legality of the proceeding, and to have refused to perform the contract. The plaintiff then brought his action for damages.

The question for the Court was on the construction of the

H

Act of George IV., which the plaintiff contended did not affect contracts entered into in a foreign country with respect to slaves held in that country. By the law of Brazil, the contract was binding and could be enforced, and consequently, if not expressly prohibited by English law to Englishmen all over the world, it would by international law be capable of enforcement in an English Court, if entered into in Brazil by Englishmen or their agents. The statute is plain enough with respect to the kind of acts forbidden; the question is, whether it is confined to acts done in the British dominions. Now, one of the points urged by the plaintiff was, that in the year 1843 another Act, the 6th and 7th Victoria, cap. 97, was passed, which recites the statute of George IV., and continues,—“That it is expedient that the provisions of that Act should be deemed to apply and extend to render unlawful the several acts, matters, and things therein mentioned, when committed by British subjects in foreign countries and settlements not belonging to the British Crown, in like manner and to all intents and purposes as if the same were done and committed by such persons within the British dominions, colonies, or settlements.” And it is then enacted that “all the provision of the said Consolidated Slave Trade Act.....shall.....be deemed to extend and apply to British subjects wheresoever residing and being,” &c. It was contended for the plaintiff that these sections were enacting, and not merely declaratory, and consequently established by implication that prior to 1843 British

subjects could become lawfully the purchasers of slaves in foreign countries. If that were established, then the English shareholders would have the right to sell to M. Santos, for by the same Act of 1843 it is enacted,—“That in all the cases in which the holding or taking of slaves shall not be prohibited by this or any other Act of Parliament, it shall be lawful to sell or transfer such slaves, anything in this or any other Act notwithstanding.” If, then, the British shareholders came legally into possession of these slaves under the Act of 1824, they may legally sell them to M. Santos, the Acts of 1824 and 1843 notwithstanding.

The Court of Common Pleas has decided that even under the Act of George IV., such investments of British capital were illegal. In the case of Zulueta, a Spanish merchant resident in London, the point was raised whether a slave-trading in foreign parts was prohibited by the statute. The opinion was expressed by the Court, that that trading was so prohibited; and it was further held, and the Court of Common Pleas now decided, that even before 1843 British subjects were forbidden from purchasing slaves in any part of the world, certain British colonies excepted. “The true construction of the statute 5th George IV., cap. 113,” says the Court, “appears to be to prohibit trading in slaves by all persons in the control of the Legislature—that is, by British subjects all over the world, and by foreigners while locally within the British dominions. Upon this construction the purchase of the slaves in question was illegal by the 2nd

and 10th sections of that Act, and consequently the 6th and 7th Victoria does not authorize a resale. The plaintiff cannot sue for breach of a contract entered into in violation of English law, and therefore judgment must be for the defendants."

The result of this judgment is, that the negroes purchased by the many Anglo-South American mining and other companies which sprang up about 30 years ago are declared to have been illegally acquired. Since 1843 there can be no doubt that such purchases have been illegal; the present judgment declares that the prohibition extends back for nineteen years before. Any acquisition of slaves by purchase by a British subject within the last 35 years has been illegal, and the only way in which he can now legally become possessed of such property is "by inheritance, bequest, devise, marriage, or otherwise by operation of law."

12. THE WAR IN ITALY, TREATY OF PEACE.—*Electric Telegram.*

The official telegraphic despatch, of which the following is a translation, was posted on the Paris Bourse at 1.10 P.M.

"Valleggio, July 12.

"The Emperor to the Empress.

"A treaty of Peace has been signed between the Emperor of Austria and myself.

"The conditions of Peace are the following:—

"An Italian Confederation, under the honorary presidency of the Pope.

"The Emperor of Austria gives up his rights over Lombardy to the Emperor of the French, who remits them to the King of Sardinia.

"The Emperor of Austria

keeps Venetia, but it is to form a part of the Italian Confederation.

"A general amnesty."

THE LATE WAR IN ITALY.—*Losses of the Belligerents.*—The French paper, the *Journal des Debats*, publishes a statement of the losses of the allied armies and the Austrians in the different combats and battles of the campaign in Italy:—

"At Montebello: Allies, 7000 engaged, 850 killed and wounded; Austrians, 13,000 engaged, 1150 killed and wounded, and 150 prisoners.—Palestro: Allies, 21,000 engaged, 1400 killed and wounded; Austrians, 24,000 engaged, 2100 killed and wounded, 950 prisoners, and 6 pieces of cannon.—Magenta and Turbigo: French, 55,000 engaged, 4400 killed and wounded, 200 prisoners and 1 cannon; Austrians, 75,000 engaged, 13,000 killed and wounded, 7000 prisoners and 4 cannon.—Melegnano: French, 16,000 engaged, 900 killed and wounded; Austrians, 18,000 engaged, 1400 killed and wounded, 900 prisoners.—Solferino: Allies, 145,000 engaged, 16,800 killed and wounded, 350 prisoners; Austrians, 170,000 engaged, 21,000 killed and wounded, 7000 prisoners, and 30 cannon. According to this statement the total loss in killed and wounded of the Allies, was 24,350, and of the Austrians 38,650, making a difference against the latter of 14,300. The number of French taken prisoners was only 300, while the Austrians lost 16,000. The French took 40 pieces of cannon, and the Austrians only 1."

These figures are in every respect doubtful, both as regards the numbers engaged and the

loss sustained. A statistical account published at Brescia states that the thirty-seven hospitals of that town received after the battle of Solferino 32,916 wounded; viz. 17,345 French, 13,959 Italians, and 1612 Austrians; 26,038 have recovered, 1273 have died.

13. EFFECTS OF THE HEAT.—The excessive heat of the 12th and 13th instant caused many deaths and a great amount of illness. Many persons working in the fields or engaged in laborious occupations were killed by "sun-stroke," or died from illnesses produced by exposure. A considerable number of persons suddenly affected, while in the streets, were taken to the hospitals; others were conveyed to or were taken ill at their own homes. The police suffered very much while on duty. The local newspapers relate a great number of cases.

— GREAT FIRE IN SHAD THAMES.—About 1 o'clock in the afternoon, the great flour-mills, in Shad Thames, belonging to Messrs. Parkes, were discovered to be on fire. The premises were six stories high; the fire commenced on the fourth floor, and rapidly extended over the whole buildings. The two floating and numerous land engines were soon on the spot, and the firemen exerted themselves strenuously to subdue the flames; but without effect as regards these premises, for floor after floor fell, and finally the flames burst through the roof, igniting the adjoining premises. The heat was so intense that the numerous warehouses near, containing vast stores of hemp, resin, and other merchandise seemed on the point of bursting into flames. The fire-

brigade, therefore, turned their attention to their preservation, and fortunately with success. Messrs. Parkes' mill was totally destroyed, together with the costly machinery and many thousand quarters of wheat, flour, &c. The fire is said to have been thus occasioned:—While the workmen were engaged in the "dressing-room," on the fourth floor, a wire of the machine broke. A man took a light into the place to see to put on another wire; but when he entered, the husk from the wheat took fire from the light, and the place was so instantaneously in a blaze, that the men had great difficulty in escaping.

14. SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH TO DENMARK.—The managers have received, by its own agency, the intelligence of the successful laying of the submarine telegraph cable between Cromer and Denmark. The task was commenced on Monday morning, and completed on Thursday. This line will place our military post or colony of Heligoland in direct communication with the authorities at home. Last autumn a cable was laid from the same point of the Norfolk coast to Embden.

15. ARSON.—The crime of arson seems to have prevailed as an epidemic this season. Besides some remarkable civil actions against insurance companies for the recovery of money assured, the summer assizes have tried numerous indictments for the offence.

At Hertford, Eliza Clare, a girl of 16, after a quarrel with her mistress, set fire to a shed, wherein were many valuable cattle. The fire was put out before it had

done much mischief. On inquiry being instituted the artful culprit made out such a plausible story that a fellow-servant, a boy, was nearly committed for trial as the perpetrator. She was found guilty, and sentenced to four years' penal servitude.

At Aylesbury, William Gregory, a young labourer, was tried for setting fire to a shed and four stacks. He appears to have committed the crime in order to obtain the superior luxuries of a gaol. He also was sentenced to four years' penal servitude.

At Croydon, Charlotte Hodges, 40, and her daughter, Ellen Hodges, 18, were indicted for setting fire to a public-house, of which their husband and father was the landlord. This was clearly a case of deliberate and mercenary arson. The house was insured in the Phoenix Fire Office. Hodges was in difficulties. A short time ago a fire broke out on the premises, which was extinguished betimes, and the fire-office paid a sum for damages. On the 8th July, after the house had been closed, the prisoners were seen to leave it, and soon after an alarm of fire was raised. The fire was again extinguished before material damage was done, and on investigation it was manifest that the place had been wilfully set on fire. The act was sufficiently brought home to the prisoners, who were found guilty, and sentenced to 15 years' penal servitude.

At Maidstone, Elizabeth Hotham, a child of 14, described as a servant, was tried for setting fire to her master's house, some person being therein. It seems that this girl had been sent to chapel, but child-like preferred staying away, and returned to her mas-

ter's house too early. Her delinquency brought on a severe scolding, which the child resented. That evening, during supper, a smell of fire was perceived, and on the back kitchen being entered, it was found that some articles in a cupboard were on fire. A few basins of water extinguished the flames. At night, when the mistress entered the bedroom, she found that the clothes in her cupboard were in flames. This fire was as easily put out. Soon after a third fire was discovered in the cupboard under the stairs, which was also immediately extinguished. On being questioned, she told a number of childish tales about lucifer-matches. She was found guilty, and the Judge was obliged to pass the terrible sentence appointed by law for the offence—sentence of death. His lordship, however, intimated that she would be dealt with in the most lenient manner, so that during a considerable term of imprisonment she might undergo a course of instruction and discipline.

At the same assizes, two young soldiers were sentenced to ten years' penal servitude for having set fire to, and destroyed, some corn-stacks. The motive was supposed to be to escape from military service.

At Winchester, three soldiers were sentenced to seven years' penal servitude for wilfully setting fire to a hay-rick.

16. THE ALDERSHOTT MURDER. — At the Winchester assizes, Henry Benjamin Haynes was indicted for the wilful murder of Mary McGowan, at Aldershott.

The prisoner was a private in the 9th Regiment of Foot, stationed at Aldershott. On the 5th

of March last the prisoner and a comrade named Callender were confined to the barracks, but about 10 o'clock in the evening they broke out, and went to a public-house, where women of low character resorted; they there met several girls. Callender selected one named Emma Turner, and the prisoner took the deceased, and they went up stairs to two different rooms, they remained there some time, when Turner left Callender, and went into the room where the prisoner and the deceased were. Turner told them it was time to get up, the prisoner left the bed and went into another room for a minute and returned; the deceased was then washing her arms; the prisoner went up to her, put his arm round her neck, and kissed her. The deceased then went into another room, and the prisoner followed her, and in less than a minute, Turner and Davis, another girl who had come up stairs, heard the cry of "Murder!" They ran into the room and saw the prisoner and the deceased standing together, but she was apparently sinking on the ground; the prisoner was taking his hand from her neck, and in that hand was a razor. They then observed that she was bleeding profusely from a wound in her throat. The prisoner walked to the table, put the razor in a case, and walked out of the room. The deceased said, "Lord have mercy on my soul; I hope my poor mother will forgive me; I have been a wicked sinner," and died in less than five minutes, in consequence of the wound in her throat. The prisoner was taken into custody. He said his mind had been uneasy ever since he had left America, as

he had seduced a young woman there, and she had a child by him, and he left her. He was asked what had made him kill the deceased. "I don't know, poor girl, she never did me any harm. It was not her I intended to kill, it was Margaret Cheltenham, who caused me to be kept in the hospital, and it was the devil did it." Margaret Cheltenham lived in the adjoining house.

The prisoner's counsel argued that, as there was no suggestion of motive, the prisoner must have been insane at the time he committed the act, and called the sergeant of the prisoner's company, who stated that the prisoner was ordinarily very well behaved, but sometimes appeared to be rambling in his mind, particularly when he had had a little drink. He used frequently to talk about a woman he had seduced in America, and seemed to be very uneasy that he had not married her.

Some of the jury appeared to have doubts about the prisoner's sanity, and asked the learned Judge for directions; but ultimately found him guilty. Although the Judge passed sentence of death upon the prisoner, it appeared that his lordship did not anticipate that that sentence would be carried out, and it was commuted.

18. WIFE MURDER AT HULL.—At the York assizes John Riley was indicted for the wilful murder of Alice Riley, his wife, at Hull, on the 3rd of July inst.

The prisoner and the deceased had been married some time and had several children, and lived the early part of their married life at Grimsby, in Lincolnshire. While living there, upwards of a

year ago, they had a violent quarrel, in consequence of which his wife left him, and came to Hull, where she endeavoured to maintain herself as a sempstress and by a profligate course of life. The prisoner shortly followed her, and they lived together again, the husband in idleness, being supported by his wife's profligacy. They quarrelled greatly, and as a consequence of some act of violence the prisoner had been sent to prison, whence he was released in June. It appeared that the woman was addicted to drink, and her habit was on those occasions to go to bed and sleep off the effects of it. On the 3rd of July last a young girl called Amelia and a collier called at their lodgings and breakfasted with them, and after breakfast the deceased had sixpennyworth of rum. The collier and Amelia left them, and the deceased being affected by the rum, went to her bedroom about 2 o'clock, and lay down in her clothes outside the bed. The prisoner told his little boy to go out and play while he had a sleep too, and the room-door was fastened by the prisoner. About 5 o'clock that afternoon a woman who lived in the house knocked at the door of the prisoner's room, and called to his wife to lend her a potato pan. Receiving no answer she went round to the window, and, the room being on the ground floor, she looked in. She then heard a noise like a loud crack, and on looking into the room she saw the prisoner suspended by the neck to two hooks in the ceiling. She immediately gave an alarm, and a man came to her assistance. They opened the window, the man got into the room, and

immediately cut the cord with his knife above the prisoner's head, who fell insensible upon the floor, and as if dead. He then ran to the bed on which Alice Riley was laid down, seemingly asleep, and shook her, crying out, "Oh, Alice, Alice, your husband has hung himself!" She did not answer, and he shook her more, and in pulling her over his hand came in contact with blood about her neck. A neighbour then came to his assistance, and in attempting to wake the deceased put his hand into a large wound in her throat, and cried out, "For God's sake send for a doctor and a policeman." She was at that time lying with her face upon her hands, as if tranquilly asleep. On looking about the room a table-knife was found on a table near the bed, wet with blood, and there was a basin with blood-stained water in it. On examining the body of the deceased she was found to have a deep gash cut across her neck, which had divided the windpipe, the carotid artery, and the jugular vein. Her death must have been instantaneous, and the surgeon who examined her was of opinion that she must have been asleep when it was inflicted. When the prisoner had in some degree recovered from the effects of his suspension, he readily admitted that it was he who had cut his wife's throat. He was found guilty, and executed.

20. OTHER THUNDERSTORMS.—Several thunderstorms, of extreme severity and of wide extent, broke over various districts of England during Wednesday, the 20th inst. In London, the first and most severe storm com-

menced at 5 A.M., and continued for two hours. It was followed by most oppressive heat. At 10 A.M. a similar storm, followed by a similar sultry atmosphere, occurred. And another, of less violence and shorter duration, succeeded at 3 P.M. The evening was serene and enjoyable. Much damage was done by the heavy fall of rain. The storm was varied at Windsor by a very heavy hailstorm, which did great damage. At the Spittal cavalry barracks 600 panes of glass were smashed, at the infantry barracks upwards of 1000; the windows of the churches, chapels, and other large buildings, were entirely destroyed—for the storm having first passed on in an easterly direction, then turned back and travelled north-west—private houses in exposed positions lost from 100 to 200 or 300 panes—greenhouses were universally laid open, the flowers were utterly beaten down and destroyed. The damage, great as it was, did not end here; for the storm traversing a wide belt of corn-land, the produce of which was now rapidly ripening, utterly destroyed it, not so much by beating it down, as by cutting off the ear, or thrashing out the corn—reducing the crop to broken useless stubble.

Many places were similarly afflicted at the same period. Bristol and its neighbourhood suffered on two successive days, when, besides damage done to trees and houses, several persons were struck down and temporarily deprived of speech or sight. At Wokingham, the storm was the most destructive that had occurred since the terrible hail-tempest in 1840, and committed

similar ravages. The hail consisted of large rough pieces of ice, which fell incessantly for half an hour. As in 1840 the course of the storm was traced by the total destruction of whole fields of ripe corn. In some the reapers were actually at work, and it was a matter almost of life that the men should rush to outhouses for shelter. Under such a pitiless storm, the conservatories, greenhouses, and all other fragile structures, were speedily destroyed; but it will give a more vivid idea of the fury of the tempest to state that gallinas and other poultry caught in open fields were killed, that young rabbits were found bruised and with broken legs, and even the strong-quilled geese were frequently so battered and bruised as to be scarcely able to make their way home.

In Yorkshire and Lancashire the storm fell with equal violence. Around Wakefield it appears to have been very destructive. The hail is described as "blocks of ice." At Pomfret, Knaresborough, Bramhope, and Otley, the storm raged with great fury. The windows of the immense factories in these districts suffered severely—the loss is almost incalculable. At Warrington alone 50,000 panes of glass are said to have been broken. The accounts also relate that several persons had been killed, and more struck by the lightning, and that many cattle, sheep, and horses had perished.

The storm appears to have extended to Ireland.

21. SALE OF WORDSWORTH'S LIBRARY.—The dispersion of the library of the poet Wordsworth—an event to which the world of

letters had looked forward with great interest—was effected on the 19th, 20th, and 21st inst., at his late residence at Rhydal. The collection consisted of about 8000 volumes in every department of literature, of no remarkable rarity, but enhanced in value by the circumstance that the margins of many were enriched by the poet's MS. annotations; nearly all had his autograph name, and a great number were presentation copies, having the autograph names both of the donors and the donee. The most interesting volumes were Moxon's small edition, in six volumes, of the poet's own works. They appear to have been his favourite companions, and are interpolated with an immense number of *variorum* reading, suggestive memoranda, and constructive mendations, and some additional short poems in pencil. The possession of this interesting copy was eagerly contested.

24. STRIKE OF THE BUILDERS.

—Uninstructed by the almost invariable failure of such movements, and the invariable misery and degradation which accompany them, the skilled workmen employed in the building trades, in and within a certain range around the metropolis, determined upon a strike. If such a course is in direct contravention of the best recognized rule of political economy—that the labour market is no exception to the universal law of demand and supply—these misguided men shaped their demands in such a manner as to be self-destructive of their movement—they stated their demand to be that they should work nine hours per day instead of ten, receiving the same

pay for a day's work. This demand, however absurdly shaped, was in effect a demand for additional wages in that ratio; but the reason they gave for this form of advance was ridiculous and oppressive—they said their object was to compel the masters to employ a larger number of hands—to find employment for a number of men who at present could not find work. The master-builders necessarily refused to acquiesce; and the men, therefore proceeded to compel compliance, by ruining the great firms one by one. They selected Messrs. Trollope's for their first victims; and as this firm persisted in protecting themselves, their men, 470 in number, left work. The matter was too serious to be left on this footing, and the masters, therefore, instantly combined, and expressed their determination to close their yards on the 6th of August, and not again to open them except upon the condition that each man should sign a certain declaration "that I am not connected with any society which directly or indirectly interferes with the arrangements of this or any other establishment, or the hours or terms of labour, and that I recognize the right of employers and employed individually to make any trade engagements on which they may choose to agree." Notwithstanding a great deal of fustian which had been spouted at meetings of the "Conference," the men had no sooner made public their demand, than they felt that they had defeated themselves. They, therefore, said little more about "ten hours' wages for nine hours' work," and

turned all their wrath upon the declaration, which they declared to be "a fiendish document."

The principal society of this trade had considerable funds at their disposal, which were appropriated, in the first instance, to the support of those men who had struck at Messrs. Trollope's. The "lock-outs" were, moreover, assisted by considerable sums sent by different trades in all parts of the country. This, however, was insufficient to give even the scantiest support to the many thousands of men, women, and children thus wantonly thrown on the world, and very great misery was suffered—endured, indeed, with the utmost patience and submission to the law; for with the exception of a few drunken outrages, the peace was not violated. Another class, who were in no way concerned with the workmen's demands, were sufferers without relief—the class of "labourers" whose humble employment as the Helots and Gibeonites of the "operatives," placed them below the sympathy of their aristocratic betters. These poor men, living from hand to mouth, were now suddenly thrown upon the world penniless and hopeless.

Many gentlemen of high station and acknowledged experience attempted to mediate between the contending parties; but as their efforts could have but one tendency—to recommend attention to the laws of political economy and of the land—without any effect upon the workman: while the masters pointed to their "declaration"—the conditions on which they were willing to give employment to any man—

as being strictly in accordance with the course recommended. In truth, it was not the bearing of this document upon the strike which startled the men, but its general effect upon the constitution and operation of all trade combinations. That the men of any trade are completely under the domination of the leaders of the society is well-known, and not less notorious how those leaders have exercised their power. The master-builders gave many examples of the oppressive interference of the "committee" with their trade—for instance, one rule was, that no bricklayer should lay down his trowel so as to permit his right hand to assist his left in any part of his work—thereby compelling the employment of a subsidiary labourer. The unionists, however,—ignoring these notorious facts, and the equally well-known fact, that the great firms in every department of trade encourage and sometimes "found" associations for the mutual benefit of their workpeople—loudly asserted that the object of the declaration was to destroy all trade-benefit societies, sick funds, and annuities.

A cessation of ten weeks produced an exhaustive effect upon the funds of the "lock-outs;" and in the meanwhile the masters were not wholly idle. There are a considerable number of men who do not belong to any society—"non-society men;" these were not affected by the rash resolves of the Conference. The masters brought up many workmen from the provinces, who were glad to take the opportunity of doing ten hours' work for ten hours'

wages on the London scale, and of improving their skill by London experience. The masters finding the time ripe, now announced their willingness to employ, individually, any man who would sign the declaration; and the simple law of supply and demand produced its necessary result. Many of the unionists who had resisted the strike, though they had complied with their leaders' orders, came in and signed; an evasion was invented by others that they signed the obnoxious document as "a shop rule," not as "a trade rule." So that, as time passed on, the workshops again became busy, and by the close of the year, very little was heard of the strike.

In the meanwhile, however, the influence of this unjustifiable step had been felt far and wide. The merchant, whose consignments from abroad are necessary for the progress of the building trade, and the wholesale trader in necessary articles, had to meet heavy engagements with their stock unsaleable; and the retail dealer, whose existence depends on the daily sales over his counter, either closed his shop or gave ruinous credit to his poor customers. Again, the large and beautiful works in progress in the metropolis were left unfinished, exposed to the injurious influences of a wet and frosty autumn. In some cases, joint-stock speculations, in which vast sums were embarked, were brought to a stand-still; as in the case of the Westminster Palace Hotel, the proprietary of which, beside the money locked up in the building, will lose an entire year of the immense busi-

ness from which they calculated to derive their profit.

The consideration which the managers of great undertakings generally showed to the contractors, no doubt baulked one of the calculations of the unionists; as the unanimity and readiness with which it was accorded tended to show them how inconsiderate was their course.

25. BRUTAL OUTRAGES.—At the Stafford assizes, four savages were tried for the wilful murder of a woman, name unknown, at Tipton.

This was one of those cases which sometimes startle us into doubts whether we live in a more than half-civilized land. The poor woman who was the victim of these barbarous outrages was a miserable outcast, without a home or means, and lived by hanging about public-houses by day, and sleeping in hovels or in the warmth of the furnaces of this district. On the night in question she was intoxicated, and in this condition fell into the hands of a number of foremen and puddlers. These wretches commenced chasing and ill-treating the poor creature, whose outcries and the yells of her persecutors were heard for some time. Four of the wretches then committed repeated rapes upon her; and as she screamed fearfully during these outrages and subsequent ill-treatment, they beat her most brutally, and committed violence that cannot be described. In the morning, the victim was found dead in a canal basin. The charge of murder failed for want of precise proof; but the indictment for rape was fully sustained. One of the prisoners, indeed, had admitted his guilt. They were all found guilty; three of

them were sentenced to penal servitude for life; the fourth for five years.

25. WIFE-MURDER. — At the Stafford assizes, William Worsey, 24, innkeeper, was indicted for the murder of his wife, at West Bromwich, on the 11th of June last.

This case was another of the too frequent instances of murder arising from domestic quarrels. The prisoner and his wife, in the opinion of neighbours, lived pretty comfortably together, although they did quarrel and swear at one another. On the morning of the fatal occurrence they had a quarrel about getting breakfast ready, which the wife refused to do on the ground of some previous quarrel. "There were cursing words used on both sides," said a maid-servant. The prisoner seized his wife by the wrist, forced her into the back-kitchen, and there hit her several times with a whip. A great noise accompanied and followed this proceeding; and in a few seconds the wife staggered into the parlour bleeding profusely from the neck. The prisoner followed in great alarm, and appears to have assisted the poor woman with care, and exclaimed, repeatedly, "Will no one go for a doctor?" His wife died in about 20 minutes. There was no witness to the act, but the prisoner stated that in the passion of the moment he had seized a sharp-pointed carving-knife and hurled it at his wife, and that it struck her on the neck. A surgeon stated that the fatal missile must have gone straight to the mark—it entered under the left ear and came out under the right ear, passing through the windpipe and severing the carotid artery and

jugular veins on both sides. It was such a wound as might have been inflicted by a missile weapon, and could scarcely have been done by a thrust, as there was not lateral action.

The jury found the prisoner *Guilty*, recommending him to mercy, on the ground that the act was probably not premeditated. The sentence of death was, in consequence, commuted.

26. GOODWOOD RACES. — The fashionable meeting at Goodwood this year was a complete success. The Craven Stakes were won by Lord Clifden's Star of the East: the Steward's Cup by Mr. Gratwicke's Maid of Kent; the Gratwicke Stakes by Mayonnaise. On Wednesday, the Goodwood Stakes by Mr. Ten Broeck's American horse Starke. On Thursday, the Goodwood Cup by Mr. W. Day's Promised Land. On Friday, the Nursery Stakes by Mr. Ten Broeck's Umpire, the Chesterfield Cup by Mr. W. S. S. Crawford's Zuyder Zee, and the Bentinck Memorial by Starke, whose owner, Mr. Ten Broeck, is said to win £30,000 at this meeting.

— GREAT FIRE AT LIVERPOOL.

—There has been a succession of great fires at Liverpool, by which a vast quantity of property was destroyed, and some lives lost.

On the 26th of July the North Shore Corn Mill was burnt; the fire is supposed to have been caused by the friction of the stones. Three men cut off by the flames, leaped from lofty windows and were killed: the charred bodies of two others were found in the ruins. Six persons received serious injuries. On the 17th August, a very extensive conflagration occurred, late at night, in some extensive

warehouses in Love Lane. The buildings were stored with cotton, corn, and other merchandize. The premises were totally destroyed, together with 3000 or 4000 bales of cotton; the corn was either burnt or rendered useless. The damage is estimated at from 25,000*l.* to 30,000*l.* On the 14th September there was a great fire on the premises of Messrs. Kilpin and Montgomery, builders and contractors. The damage is estimated at 10,000*l.* or 15,000*l.*

26. GREAT FIRE IN THE LONDON DOCKS.—A very alarming fire broke out in the brandy vault of the London Docks. This vault is appropriated exclusively to the storing of brandies, and contained at this time upwards of 20,000 casks of the finest description of spirits. At 8 A.M., when the Docks were opened for business, the principal trap was opened, and the cellarman entered. There was then no indication of fire; but about 9.15 an alarm was given that the vault was on fire, and soon after a dense black smoke began to issue from the traps in volumes. The principal authorities were soon on the spot, and the utmost exertions were made, though without effect, to stifle the fire. As a conflagration of such materials is in the highest degree destructive—partly because water has little effect on flaming spirits, and partly because these materials are very explosive—the alarm was given to the different brigade stations with the utmost speed. Speedily the two immense floating engines, and eight land engines belonging to the brigade, and those belonging to these and the neighbouring docks, were

brought into action, and as it was fortunately high water, immense volumes were poured into the burning vault. The uttermost exertions of the assistants were long baffled by an unexpected cause—the dense black smoke charged with a suffocating odour from the burning spirits which struck down the strongest after a few minutes' exposure. As the firemen and dock-labourers fell they were dragged out by others ready to take their places. At one time not fewer than 50 men were lying insensible on the quay—some of them in a very dangerous condition. It was 1 P.M. before the fire was got under. When the vault could be examined it was found that, though the damage was much less than had been anticipated, the danger had been very great. Whole tiers of casks containing spirits, in some cases 50 per cent. above proof, had been actually on fire and were deeply charred; but the number destroyed did not exceed 50. The cause of the fire could not be ascertained.

26. WRECK OF THE "SILISTRIA."—About three years ago several fine screw-steamers were built in the Clyde for the Turkish Government. These vessels were placed under the charge of Turkish captains and crews, whose ignorance, folly, and villany appear to exceed everything that the most satirical writers have ascribed to the Turks.

The *Silistria* left Alexandria on the 25th June, with about 350 persons on board. The next day, about noon, a loud crash was heard among the timbers of the ship, and the engine stopped. It was shortly set in motion again, by whose orders is not

known, and the crash was again heard, the screw was broken, and the water was entering the hold rapidly. For an hour nothing was done towards stopping the leak; but at last a Russian engineer on board made his way to the hole and attempted to stop it with tarred hemp, which probably prevented the ship from sinking rapidly. The captain embraced him when he came on deck, and relapsed into his former state of bewildered incompetence. With the exception of a pump on deck, out of order, no means existed of clearing the ship of water, and the only hope was to take off the after skylight and try to empty the cabins by buckets. Not a soul of the crew or Turkish passengers afforded the least assistance, and the pump was manned and the buckets worked by the European passengers and 28 Austrian sailors who were on board. The crew refusing to work, there were too few to keep the water under, and it soon began to enter at the stern ports. The captain consented to throw overboard a part of the cargo; but the Turkish passengers, in a paroxysm of stupid fanaticism apparently, rose on the Europeans and threatened them with their pistols and daggers if they attempted to speak to the captain.

The night of the 25th was employed in incessant labour as regards the Europeans, while the Turkish crew slept on the deck. On the morning of the 26th an Egyptian government brig laden with wood, commanded by Reis Ibrahim, hove in sight, bound for Alexandria. The captain of the *Silistria* sent on board offering him an indemnity if he would

abandon his cargo and take the passengers of the steamer on board, and endeavour to tow her into Alexandria. The Egyptian would do nothing except cast them a tow rope, having probably little faith in the promises of the respectable Mustafa Bey. This individual marched about with a pistol in each hand, threatening all who approached the boats which he had lowered and guarded by marines. About five in the evening the women were at length allowed to go on board the brig, and in the course of the night Said Pacha, the Turkish Commissary at Djeddah, and his suite, carefully removed all his effects, but the three boats which conveyed him did not return to the steamer. The captain of the brig still refused to abandon his cargo, and finally cut the tow rope, going off with the boats, and leaving the *Silistria* to her fate.

Then came a horrible scene of pillage and violence, the Turks plundering the baggage of the Europeans, in which they were joined by the crew, and a complete saturnalia ensued. They then seized the sole remaining boat, throwing into the sea the Europeans who attempted to embark, and cutting off the head of a young Austrian with an axe, in the *mêlée*. On the 27th the water had reached the bulwarks, and the workers were exhausted. Happily the Egyptian brig reappeared, the boats came back, and a *sauf qui peut* commenced; but the ferocious Turkish passengers opposed every attempt on the part of the Europeans to save those who were exhausted by the labour at the pumps. Shortly after, the *Silistria* went down, with 77 persons on board,

the brig carrying into Alexandria 273 passengers and sailors, the Europeans being exposed during the passage to the violence and brutality of the Turks.

According to another account the commander Mustafa was so intently engaged in plundering the valuables of his passengers, that when the vessel sunk he went down with her. Said Pacha, who was the Sultan's commissary to inquire into the massacres at Jeddah, was the first to commit outrages upon the Christians; and the persons who perished, or some of them, were slain by the fanatical robbers. The consuls of the several nations, whose subjects were murdered or maltreated, had joined in demanding redress. An inquiry was ordered, but with so little desire to arrive at the truth, that the consuls withdrew in disgust. And no wonder that the authorities were determined to screen the offenders; for it appears that the English engineer had reported the engine to be dangerously out of repair. He was told, "God is great. Make this one voyage, and when you return the matter shall be attended to." The engineer instantly resigned, and the senior Turkish stoker was appointed to the post!

It appears incidentally in the accounts that a short time previously the sister ship the *Kars*, had been wrecked by the ignorance of the Turkish captain, when some 200 persons perished.

26. THE JARROW MURDER.—At the Durham assizes John Shafto Wilthew, aged 55, was indicted for the wilful murder of his wife, Susannah Wilthew, at Jarrow, on the 19th of July.

It was stated by the counsel

for the Crown that the prisoner was gatekeeper at Messrs. Palmer's iron ship-building yard at Jarrow. He lived in a small house in Druid's Buildings, with his wife, three children, and his wife's brother, named Charlton. His wife was 51 years of age, and had borne him eleven children. She was a careful, good wife, and attended to his home. On the evening preceding the murder the prisoner and Charlton returned from their work, and the family set up talking until 11 o'clock, when Charlton went to bed, leaving the prisoner and his wife up. They had no words and no quarrel. Next morning at 4 o'clock Charlton was awoke by his sister, the prisoner's wife, coming into his room and to his bedside in her nightdress, with her hair hanging down her back, and holding her throat with her nightdress against it in one hand, while she shook him and made signs to him with the other. Blood at that time was pouring from her throat and running down on to the floor. A few minutes after he saw the prisoner come across from his room and go into the yard. He said to the prisoner, "What is this you have been doing?" The prisoner muttered something, but he could not tell what he said. The witness shouted out to his niece, "Your father has cut your mother's throat." The deceased then went into the yard and into the privy, holding her chemise up to her throat, which was bleeding very much, and returned shortly after into the house. An alarm was given, and a doctor attempted to sew up her throat, but she died about twenty minutes after. There was a gash in her throat five inches long, and cut

down to within an eighth of an inch of the vertebrae. The wind-pipe was severed, and the jugular vein divided. Shortly after her death the prisoner was found lying on his face in a pool of his wife's blood, nearly insensible, and with a superficial gash in his own throat, which had been inflicted by a razor found beside him. He had lost a good deal of blood, and was almost pulseless, but rallied soon on being placed on a bed. [When the prisoner was placed at the bar his throat was still bound up with plaister.] The razor with which the wound on the deceased had been inflicted belonged to Charlton, and was seen in the prisoner's hand afterwards, and by him was placed, covered with blood, on a chest of drawers.

The counsel for the prisoner elicited by cross-examination of the witnesses, that the prisoner had long entertained suspicions of his wife's fidelity, and that he had brooded over this idea until he had convinced himself that his suspicions were true. It appeared, however, that there was not the slightest ground for the doubt. On this the learned gentleman attempted to form a defence of temporary insanity; but the jury, with the sanction of the learned Judge, found the prisoner guilty; and his sentence of death was carried into execution.

27. THE STICKNEY MURDER.—A strange case of murder has been tried at the Lincoln assizes. Two young labourers—mere youths—named Henry Carey and William Picket, were indicted for the murder of an elderly man named William Stevenson, on the 17th of March last. Early in the morning of that day one Mary

Semper, who lived hard by Stevenson's cottage, went out from her home, and saw what she supposed to be a shirt in a deep sewer. She looked a little closer into the matter, and found that the shirt covered the body of a murdered man, who had been fearfully beaten and bruised, and then cast into the sewer. All around there were marks of a fearful struggle. The grass was trodden down, and there was blood upon it. Then there were footmarks, and indications that some persons had been dragging some heavy weight across the road. A broken hedge was bloody for about a foot's breadth. In one place there were three broken fragments of a hedgestake covered with blood. In a field were two more bludgeons—one of them a rough wooden rail—also streaked with blood. In the sewer where the body was found there were the fragments of another bludgeon, and all appearances seemed to show that the struggle for life must have been a desperate one.

When the story came to be inquired into it was found that the dead man had been drinking on the previous night at a place called the Ship Inn, in company with the two prisoners and another man, who turned out to be entirely free from all suspicion. Stevenson remained at the Ship until about half-past 10 at night, and a few minutes afterwards Carey and Picket followed him, Carey being in liquor and Picket sober. It was now that the notion of murdering Stevenson, in order to secure the trifle of money which might be in his pocket, occurred to their minds. They followed him on his path, and killed him deliberately by beating him

to death with bludgeons, though he seems to have made a stout defence. Between 5 and 6 o'clock the next morning they were found fast asleep in a hovel, and the same day were taken into custody. On Carey was found a knife, which was identified as one that had belonged to Stevenson. They were taken before the magistrates, and here Picket made what he intended should be received as a full account of the transaction. He admitted that he had been present at the murder, although he threw, or endeavoured to throw, all the guilt of it upon Carey. As he represented it, it was as they were going down a certain lane, and Mr. Stevenson was walking in front of them, that Carey proposed to kill him, saying, "I think he's got some money." On this, despite of Picket's remonstrances—this is his own story—Carey stepped up behind Stevenson and struck him so violent a blow with the bludgeon he carried in his hand that he brought him to the ground. Then the murdering began, and lasted a good while. Picket endeavoured to persuade the magistrates that the part he subsequently took in the transaction—such as helping Carey to carry the body to the sewer—was done in the bewilderment of the moment, and that the whole transaction was set on foot, and the guilty part of it carried out, exclusively by his companion.

This confession, as is usually the case in such matters, merely operated to insure Picket's own conviction. On his own admission he had been a participator in the murder, although the ingenuity of his counsel tried to convert this position into that of an ac-

VOL. CI.

complice after the fact. The most curious part of the story, however was, that in consequence of Picket's endeavours to exculpate himself at Carey's expense, Carey, towards the conclusion of the trial the other day at Lincoln, made a full confession, in which he threw all the guilt upon Picket. Of course, according to the rules of evidence, the confession of each was only evidence against himself; but each admitted that he was there, more or less actively participating in the murder. The jury took the very proper view of it that both were equally guilty, and brought in a verdict of "Wilful Murder" against both. The murderers found on the old man's body one sovereign, one half-crown, and one shilling. Picket insisted upon having the sovereign, because, as he said, "it would clear his score for the spree at Boston." Carey took 3s. 6d. by the adventure, besides a pocket-knife. Their original intention, according to their own statement, was merely to rob, not to murder, the old man. They had covered their faces with handkerchiefs with holes in them, so that they could see without being recognized, and one of these was marked with the name of Picket's old sweetheart. The plain truth seems to be, that the two ruffians had resolved to rob the old man, and if they could have done this by simply knocking him down they would have been content. They were, however, fully prepared to murder him if need were; and, as their victim recognized them, the need did arise. It is not often that these pages chronicle so sottish, so clownish, and at the same time, so hideous a crime. Hot with drink, two ruffians

stagger out of an alehouse in pursuit of an old man who had been drinking in their company. They pull stakes out of a hedge, and when they come up to him knock him down. The stakes break, they pluck others, and beat him to death. They search his pockets, and extract from them 1*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.*, the price of their night's work. They then cast the body into the sewer, retire into a hovel, and fall into a sleep of drunkenness and murder. They suffer themselves to be caught next day; each accuses the other, and insures his own condemnation. Can the force of stupidity and ruffianism be pushed much further? This stolid insensibility to moral law existed to the last; for they derived just so much from the religious exhortations of the chaplain as to become convinced that they were now going to Heaven, and perished in this frightful state of mind.

28. EXPLOSION OF A PERCUSSION-CAP FACTORY.—A disastrous explosion has occurred at Messrs. Ludlow's percussion-cap factory, Legge Street, Birmingham. Shortly before 7 o'clock in the evening, when the 50 hands employed were about to leave the premises, a tremendous explosion shattered the buildings; the roofs and walls were blown away, and the materials, machinery, and furniture crushed into an indistinguishable mass. Fortunately the explosion appears to have occurred in the upper story of the building, to which circumstance the workmen below owed their comparative safety; for, although many were injured, only three persons appear to have perished in the ruins—one an elderly woman, whose long expe-

rience had promoted her to the dangerous occupation of priming the copper caps—she was blown to pieces. One, or perhaps two, of the workmen were also killed. Several persons in the streets and houses adjoining were injured. A man was in his attic looking after his pigeons; the wall of his room was blown in, and both his legs were broken. One of the workwomen was dreadfully burnt. These persons, it was thought, were mortally injured.

Although so serious an accident might reasonably have suggested to the authorities the necessity of taking measures to render such destructive manufactories less fatal to human life, the warning was altogether disregarded, and two months later another percussion-cap manufactory, situated in the very heart of Birmingham, blew up with terrible slaughter. [See September 28.]

THE HOT WEATHER. — Since the institution of trustworthy records in 1771—88 years back—there has been no instance of such continuous hot weather in July as prevailed during this month of 1859. On the 12th the temperature of the air in shade reached 92½°, on the 13th and 18th 93°. The mean temperature of those days was 75°·7, 75°·2, and 74°·3 respectively. In the years 1826 and 1837 the mean temperature exceeded 70° on nine days; but back to the year 1814 there is no instance in the month of July of such high temperature. The mean temperature of the month, as might be expected from these facts, was remarkable, viz., 68°·1; whilst its average, as found from 88 years' consecutive observations, is 61°·4; the excess of temperature, there-

fore, for the whole month is $6^{\circ}7$. The highest average previously recorded is 67° in 1778, and as the average of this July is $68^{\circ}1$, it exceeds all previous records by $1^{\circ}1$.

SHIPWRECKS AND FIRES AT SEA.

—The underwriters at Lloyds' have received intelligence of some serious losses at sea by wreck and fire.

On the 16th June, the fine Indiaman *Blenheim*, owned by Messrs. Duncan Dunbar & Sons, of Limehouse, was traversing the Bay of Bengal, bound for Calcutta. She was caught in a tremendous gale or typhoon, by which it was evident she would speedily be overwhelmed. The captain and crew had scarcely betaken themselves to the boats when the ship foundered by their side. One boat reached the shore in safety; but the other was swamped in the surf, and the captain, second mate, and eleven seamen perished.

On the 28th June (or July), the clipper barque *Shepherdess*, with a valuable general cargo, was entering Algoa Bay, when she struck upon a reef, and rolling heavily on the rock, she broke in two in a few minutes, and went down with all hands. Only two seamen out of a crew of fourteen officers and men were saved.

On the 10th July, the Glasgow brig, *Eliza Bain*, while lying in Kingston Harbour, was discovered to be on fire. Notwithstanding the utmost exertions of the fire-brigade, and a large number of soldiers and others, the vessel was totally consumed. Several men were injured by the falling of the masts.

On the 18th July, the American ship *Josephine*, 1000 tons register,

with a cargo of rice, was totally destroyed in the harbour of Mauritius. The loss is estimated at 10,000*l*.

On the 31st July, the *Glance*, from New York for Hamburgh, with resin and cotton, caught fire off the Flemish bank, in the British Channel. She was towed to the harbour of Browshaven, but when off the entrance the flames burst forth with terrific violence, and in a few hours she was burnt to the water's edge. The loss is estimated at 15,000*l*.

AUGUST.

2. DESTRUCTIVE FIRES IN LONDON.—About 10 P.M. of the 2nd inst. a fire broke out on the premises of Messrs. Blackman & Son, Rupert Street, Whitechapel. These works form one of the most extensive cooperages in London, and cover half an acre of ground, filled with piles of combustible materials. They are surrounded by other manufactories of vast extent, and containing valuable merchandise, and it was apprehended that the burning staves would spread destruction around. The great exertions of the firemen prevented this calamity, and confined the flames to Messrs. Blackman's premises. About 30,000 valuable staves, and an enormous quantity of casks, were consumed.

On the 8th inst., at a very early hour, the celebrated oil refinery, a portion of the great soap factory of Messrs. Hawes, was discovered to be on fire. From the nature of the stock the fire raged furiously, the water appearing to have no effect on the flames,

which were not subdued until very great damage had been done.

2. ACCIDENTS ON THE LONDON AND BLACKWALL RAILWAY.—Two rather serious accidents have occurred on this line within a brief space.

On the 1st August, a Tilbury train had arrived at the main station in Fenchurch-street, at 1.30 P.M., and had landed its passengers on the platform. The engine then attempted to cross the rails for the purpose of taking in water. In doing so it came in collision with a train from North Woolwich which was just entering the station, and which carried a large number of passengers. The shock, from the oblique position in which the moving bodies came into contact, was severe. The Tilbury engine was upset, and the carriages of the Woolwich train much shattered. A few of the passengers received severe injuries; but there was scarcely one who was not more or less hurt by the shock.

On the 17th instant, as the afternoon express train from Thames Haven, with passengers from the Margate steam-boat, had arrived at the curve by which the southern branch is connected with the London line, the engine, just as it was passing the centre, ran off the rails, and shot obliquely across the rails, dragging with it the tender, the guard's break and van, and three carriages. The coupling between the third and fourth carriages broke, whereby the remaining part of the train was left on the rails. The engine and tender were embedded in the field, the three carriages and break were turned on their sides and much

shattered. One passenger was killed, and several were very seriously injured.

2. THE LEDBURY MURDER.—At the Hereford Assizes, there was a trial for murder committed with circumstances of great mystery, and which still remains shrouded in doubt.

John Isaac Jones, 26, attorney's clerk, was charged with the wilful murder of Harriet Baker, at Ledbury, on the 17th of May, 1859.

The prisoner was a young man, with light hair and sharp features, apparently of an excitable temperament. He had lost one leg. As the trial occupied the greater part of three days, and resulted in the acquittal of the accused, it will suffice to give the case attempted to be established for the Crown. It appeared that the prisoner was a clerk in the office of Mr. Masfield, a solicitor of Ledbury, and the deceased Mrs. Baker had charge of that gentleman's offices. On the night of the murder, the 17th of May, Mr. Masfield had gone to London. Mr. Woodward, one of the clerks, remained at Mr. Masfield's house till a late hour at night, and when he left, at about 10 o'clock, he met the prisoner going towards Mr. Masfield's office, or, it might be, towards the prisoner's house, which adjoined thereto. There was a back door to Mr. Masfield's office, and by the passage which led to it, the prisoner could also reach the back door of the house next door, which was Mr. Bowcott's house, where the prisoner resided. At about 10 o'clock on the Tuesday night a Mrs. Jackson left the deceased, apparently preparing to go to bed. The

back door had been fastened, and the bell put upon it. When Mrs. Jackson left there was nothing on Mrs. Baker's table, but the next morning, when the house was entered, there were a table-cloth and two glasses, a jug containing some water, and sugar; in one of the glasses there was gin-and-water, on the table. The house had not been forced in any way; and therefore, when it was discovered in the morning that Mrs. Baker was murdered, the inference was that she had been murdered by some one who had obtained access to the house in a friendly manner. The prisoner had recently bought some gin. The prisoner, at the time in question, lived in a chamber in Bowcott's house, which did not put him in communication with the other people in the house, and he used a latch-key, which opened the back door of his house. Bowcott put out his own light at 20 minutes past 10, and at that time he had not heard the prisoner come in. The next morning the prisoner got up early, and went out to clean his shoes. Among the things missed from Mr. Masfield's premises were some small silver coins, one of which was a particular sixpence, and in a lane much frequented by labouring men at an early hour in the morning a packet of coins was found, which could not have been there at an early hour. The suggestion was that the prisoner had thrown them there. The prisoner had his breakfast on that morning (the 18th) somewhat earlier than usual. After breakfast Bowcott, who supplied milk to Mrs. Baker, knocked at the house, and could not obtain access. Pebbles were

thrown at the windows, and the prisoner produced some peas for the same purpose. In the meantime the prisoner went to a public-house and had some brandy, and on his return he looked through the keyhole of Mr. Masfield's back door, and presently said, "Oh, I have found the key." Of the finding of that key it would appear he had given two accounts. He then unlocked the door and entered the house, and, on entering, a little girl who lived in the house was seen dressing herself, and on being asked where Mrs. Baker was, the child said she had gone out. On going up stairs in Mr. Masfield's office it was found that Mrs. Baker was laying dead upon the floor, and her clothes were on fire. The counsel for the Crown then detailed the temptation that might have led the prisoner to commit the crime. There was a book in the office, and accessible to the prisoner, which would show that at the time there were large sums of money in the office, and the book would appear to contain an entry made by the prisoner himself, after the entry as to the money, which would show that he had had the book, and might have seen the previous entries. In the prisoner's box there was found a bludgeon, such as might have caused the blow which was on the forehead of the deceased. This blow might have caused insensibility, but it was evident that death itself was caused by strangulation, effected by a cord found on the spot. Whoever intended to rob Mr. Masfield knew where to look for the plunder; for he went directly to the drawer where alone money was

kept. The prisoner had the opportunity of knowing that a large amount of money had been in the house; and from the circumstances which the learned counsel detailed, it would appear that the prisoner was not aware that a large portion of it had been removed and deposited in the bank. Only one drawer in the desk was forced open, and that was the drawer which had contained the money. The drawer in one compartment contained about 7*l.*, which was taken. Another compartment contained some money which was not touched, and No. 3 contained some postage stamps, some of which were taken and some left. Besides this circumstance to make it probable that whoever committed the robbery was intimately acquainted with the premises, were these—that the lock had been forced by instruments already on the premises, and not brought for the purpose; and that the operation had been apparently performed in the dark. The little girl had been removed to Bowcott's house, and when the girl's father came to fetch her, he asked the prisoner where the murder was committed, and he said, "In the room below." The learned counsel said that it appeared that gin-and-water had been taken by some one, and a bottle containing gin was found on a shelf over the sink. The prisoner had bought gin at Greenway's in a green bottle, and had promised to return the bottle, and he did return a bottle, but he did it in this way,—he exchanged a white bottle for a green one, and having had the green one washed with gin, he returned that bottle to Greenway. Among the articles stolen were

cheques on the National Provincial Bank, and money, and post-office stamps, some of these latter having been found on the floor of the office. It would be proved that the prisoner was poor and in want of money. He had been in the workhouse at Ledbury, and eventually became a school-master, but his salary never exceeded 18*s.* a-week. The prisoner had kept two diaries, which would show that he was altogether without friends, and not likely to be in receipt of money. The name of Jones was not the prisoner's real name, but one which he has assumed. On the 23rd of March, the prisoner had received a cheque for his quarter's salary, which was paid immediately, and evidence would be given to show that all that money must have been expended; but it would be shown that after the murder he had 11*l.* or 12*l.* in his possession. Postage stamps were stolen, and 64 were found in the prisoner's possession. In an envelope in his possession, there were found some blue stamps which cost 2*d.* It appeared that every stamp was marked with letters, and those found on the prisoner would be shown by the letters not to be duplicates with those which remained, and therefore they might have formed part of the same sheet of stamps. There was another peculiarity, which seemed to show that they belonged to the same parcel. It would also appear that, on the 28th of June, some ashes were found in the prisoner's fireplace which would be proved to be the ashes of Bank of England notes; and, as two bank-notes were missed from Mr. Masefield's office, it was suggested that these

were the two stolen notes which the prisoner had destroyed. Part of the word "bearer" was still visible on the ash. On the 30th of June some more ashes were found, which would be proved to be the remains of a cheque of the National Provincial Bank, two of which were stolen. The officer of the bank would state that when notes were spoiled he was in the habit of burning them, and he could speak, not only to the general appearance of the ash, but the letters "Nati," and "er" of the word "bearer," were visible by a microscope. After the ashes had been found, search was made for some blank cheques which had been seen in the prisoner's possession, and the remains of those cheques were found on the back premises torn up, but when the pieces were put together, they made up the three cheques on the National Provincial Bank which had been seen in his possession, and this showed that the ashes found could not have been the ashes of those cheques. The learned counsel said there was no direct evidence against the prisoner; the evidence was entirely circumstantial, which, however, was sometimes even more satisfactory than direct evidence. The counsel for the Crown proceeded to establish his case by calling numerous witnesses, who deposed to a variety of minute circumstances, which undoubtedly raised a strong suspicion that the prisoner had really committed the crime of which he was accused. The address of the prisoner's counsel on the other hand pointed out the insufficiency of the circumstantial evidence to show any conclusive—

indeed, any very strong—ground for concluding that the prisoner was really guilty; and the jury, after three hours' consultation, found a verdict of *Not Guilty*.

3. SINGULAR ACCIDENT.—*Four Persons Burnt to Death*.—Four persons have lost their lives at Hull in a very singular manner. A man named George Taylor, landlord of the Lord Durham public-house, Cross-street, in that town, had occasion to tap a puncheon of rum. For this purpose he had used a gimlet; but the hole made by the instrument not being large enough, he had the folly to heat the kitchen poker to enlarge it. On applying this instrument the spirit ignited, and an explosion took place. Taylor was dreadfully burnt on his hands and arms, his hair was singed off, and his clothes almost destroyed. He rushed into the street, and the fiery spirit instantly spread throughout the dram-shop, which was in flames in a moment. The housekeeper was in one of the back rooms, and had just time to escape unhurt; but two of Taylor's children, six years and four years old, were enveloped in the flames (which soon spread to every part of the premises), and were so much burnt that they died a few hours afterwards. There were two other children in the place: of these one was burnt to death in the place, and the other was so much burnt that she also died. So that altogether four lives were lost. The house was gutted, and a great deal of other damage was done before the fire was subdued.

6. EXPLOSION OF THE BALLINCOLLIG POWDER MILLS.—*Five lives*

lost.—About half-past 10 o'clock A.M. an explosion of gunpowder occurred at the Ballincollig Powder Mills, attended with serious destruction of human life. The explosion was distinctly heard in several parts of Cork, and even on board the steamers coming up the river, resembling the roll of distant thunder. The scene of the disaster was the storehouse at the western extremity of the works, on the banks of the river, known as No. 1 Dusting-house, but by others described as a "refining house." At that hour five men were engaged at this house in removing the powder stored there in kegs into a boat on the canal, by which communication is effected between the several departments of the mills along the bank of the river. The bodies of three only have been recovered—broken, mangled, and black masses of flesh and bone, only distinguishable by the fragments of dress which hung by them. Of the bodies of the other two, not a limb remains, but their relatives might be seen wandering over the adjacent fields, picking up black fragments of flesh and bone, which no doubt formed part of their living bodies two hours before. As no one of the workmen remained alive to tell the cause of the disaster, the coroner's jury returned a verdict of "Accidental Death." The other buildings of the establishment were destroyed or injured, a plantation of trees was torn up by the roots, and some neighbouring cottages unroofed.

6. THE NEWPORT MURDER.—At the Oxford Assizes, Matthew Francis, 26, tailor and hawker, was indicted for the wilful murder

of his wife. The prisoner was very pale, and appeared to be enduring the most intense mental anguish.

It appeared that the prisoner and his wife had lived very uncomfortably together; both were extremely violent, the husband probably the stronger. She left this miserable home, and went to live with some neighbours. At the expiration of a week, the prisoner came and endeavoured to persuade her to return to him—she refused; he gave her a week to consider of it. He came at the period he had appointed; and she again refused, but appears to have relented so far that she went and discharged a summons she had taken out against him. But he again exhibited violence, and she expressed her determination to go on the following morning and apply for another summons. On that morning the prisoner again came to the house. There were unfortunately some dinner-knives lying on a table. He asked her if she would return and live with him. She refused. He took up one of the knives, and whetted it. He then repeated his question. She refused, laughed and sang derisively. He then passed behind her, seized her, and cut her throat with a razor which he had brought with him in the pocket of an overcoat.

The circumstances above narrated do not unfortunately differ from many a sad tale of domestic quarrels and violence; the case is chiefly noticeable for the painful scene which was presented in court, and which must have pressed heavily upon the feelings of the inexperienced jurymen who were trying the case. At an early part of the evidence, the prisoner

fell forward on the bar, exclaiming, "Oh! my dear! my dear!" Some stimulants were administered, a chair was allowed, and the trial proceeded. As the evidence brought out the shameful detail of the conjugal strife, the prisoner fell off the chair in a fit, and struggled and kicked so powerfully that it required several men to hold him. It was necessary that he should be removed into the open air, and the trial was suspended. Mr. Kettle, the prisoner's counsel, said that as he had received full instruction the prisoner was under no disadvantage from his present inability to communicate with him; and the learned Judge said that unless the attack were dangerous to life, he should order the trial to proceed when the prisoner should be sufficiently recovered to be again placed at the bar; but Mr. Kettle applied for a postponement, if it should appear that his client was so far affected as to be unable to understand the effect of the evidence. After the lapse of an hour the prisoner was again brought in and the trial proceeded; but the poor wretch's moans during the rest of the proceedings were distressing. Mr. Kettle endeavoured to reduce the offence from murder to manslaughter by alleging that the act was unpremeditated and had arisen from the provocation he received from his wife; but the learned Judge in his summing up pointed out the fact that the prisoner had come to the house with a razor in his pocket, which had the heel of the blade so tied to the handle as to form it into a fitting instrument for the act he afterwards committed.

The jury found the prisoner

Guilty, and he was sentenced to be hanged; but the sentence was not carried out, it appearing probable that he was not perfectly sane.

6. WRECK OF THE "ADMELLA."—

At 5 A.M. the steamer *Admella*, running between Melbourne and Adelaide, struck upon a sunken rock off Cape Northumberland, broke immediately, and became a total wreck. The *Admella* had on board 8 cabin passengers, 34 steerage passengers, and a crew of about 30 persons. The after-compartment of the vessel had about 50 tons of copper ore as ballast, and these had the effect of keeping this portion firm on the rock. Thither all those who had not perished at the first shock betook themselves. They were now exposed to the most dreadful sufferings. The boats were washed adrift, and thus no means were left of communicating with the shore. A small quantity of provisions and water had been saved; but this by some mismanagement was washed away by the waves on the following day. Shocking to relate, from this day, Sunday, to the following Friday these poor persons were left on the fragment of wreck, without food, exposed to the pangs of hunger and thirst, and the inclemency of the weather, the sun beating fiercely on them by day and the piercing wind benumbing them by night. On Tuesday night near 20 perished by cold, and day, by day their numbers were thinned by frenzy, fever, or exhaustion. On Monday two men managed to float ashore on a raft, and with great difficulty crawled to a telegraph station many miles inland, by which the knowledge of the disaster was

flashed to all parts of South Australia, Victoria, and New South-Wales. The intelligence created the greatest excitement; at Adelaide the sittings of the Legislature were adjourned and all business suspended. Unhappily the men had been understood to say that they were the sole survivors, and some time elapsed before it was discovered that many persons were still clinging to the wreck. The most active measures were immediately taken for their preservation. A steam-boat was despatched instantly. She arrived at the reef on Thursday night, and on Friday made the most noble efforts to reach the miserable survivors; but unhappily the surf was so high that not only were all attempts of the life and whale-boats ineffectual, but their gallant crews had well nigh perished. It was not until Saturday morning that the life-boat succeeded in throwing a line over the wreck, by means of which all who were left alive were rescued. These were 23 in number—10 passengers, and 13 of the crew.

7. FATAL STEAM-SHIP COLLISION.—As the coal-laden schooner, *Robert Garden*, was on its voyage from Hartlepool to Dover, and had arrived off the South Foreland about 2 A.M., the favourite Calais steamer *Ondine*, ran into her and sunk her. A Dover pilot on board the schooner was crushed by the collision, and three of the seamen sunk with their vessel.

10. MURDER AND SUICIDE.—A double crime has been committed under very distressing circumstances. An inquest was held at the Mildmay Arms, Mildmay-park, Stoke Newington, respecting the

deaths of Elizabeth Freshfield and Clement John Carnell, the former of whom, as alleged, died from the effects of an attempt to procure abortion, and the latter from self-destruction, the deceased having cut his throat with a small lancet. The landlord of the house, No. 65, Mildmay Street, stated that his wife had let the parlours to the deceased, who assumed the name of Mr. and Mrs. Webster. On Wednesday morning week, about 5 o'clock, the witness was awoken by hearing some one go out of the house by the front door. At breakfast time his wife went up stairs, when she saw the male lodger, who said his wife had miscarried. She said, "Have you not had medical assistance?" He said, "No: it is a mere nothing." Witness's wife said, "Why not have called me up?" He (Webster) replied, "I did not wish to disturb you." When witness arrived home on Thursday evening from his business he ascertained from his wife that the case was very suspicious. Witness therefore told the deceased man that he was not satisfied with the state of affairs, and that he believed he had brought his wife there to procure her miscarriage. The deceased was very indignant. On returning home on Saturday he learnt that Mrs. Webster was very bad. At 12 o'clock at night the male deceased called him and wife upstairs, which was the first time he saw the deceased woman. She was apparently dying. "I fetched my medical man, Dr. Williamson, who asked, 'Who has been attending this lady?' I said, 'Dr. Medcalf was only called in this morning.' Dr.

Williamson said, 'I should like to see him.' The male deceased fetched him, and shortly afterwards Mrs. Webster died. The male deceased appeared in an agony of mind, and left the room and went into the garden. I stopped behind, and asked Dr. Williamson if he thought I should be justified in fetching a policeman. He said, 'Certainly.' During this time Mr. Webster was howling in the garden. I went to him, and begged he would come in doors. He said, 'I am cutting my throat,' and the blood flowed frightfully in a stream, and I felt this was no time to hesitate. I seized his wrists, and held them, and shouted for help. He threw me off. I saw I could not compete with his strength, and I ran up stairs, and told the doctors who were there, and I went and fetched a policeman, and returned in time to see Webster die. His body was taken into the house."

Dr. Williamson stated that he and Dr. Medcalf were present when the lady died, which was about 12 o'clock on Saturday night. He had no doubt that instruments were used for the purpose of procuring abortion, and that she died from hæmorrhage produced from a wound. The jury found, as to the man, that he had committed suicide while in a state of temporary insanity; and as regarded the female deceased, a verdict of *Wilful Murder* against her companion.

11. DESTRUCTION OF WALTON BRIDGE.—About 5.30 A.M., the well-known bridge across the Thames, from Walton to Halliford—built in 1750 by a Mr. Dicker, as a private speculation—

was observed to be cracking across the highway of the bridge over the centre arch, and the crack kept increasing so much as to allow parts to fall into the river; and so it remained dropping, bit by bit, until 12 o'clock, when the arch fell in with a violent crash into the bed of the river. In a short time after, the other arch fell in also with the same violence, without injury to any person or property. The noise, which was heard a considerable distance from the bridge, was like an explosion. The bridge consisted of four stone piers, between which were three truss arches of beams and joists of wood, strongly bound together with mortises, iron pins, and cramps; besides which there were five arches of brickwork on each side, to render the ascent and descent the more easy. The bridge still belongs to private parties, and is rented by the toll-collector. The centre arch was exceedingly large. A precarious communication across the broken arches was established by means of planks, and the navigation of the river was not stopped. A gentleman, who saw the fall of the arches, says, "I had crossed the river, just below the bridge, in a punt with a friend, to take a sketch of it from the Walton side, when the falling of a few stones from the broken arch warned us to quicken our speed; and, before we had well reached the shore, the pier suddenly gave way, and the two large arches on either side, with the roadway, for some 150 or 200 yards, fell into the river below with a tremendous crash. The water splashed up like a fountain, and the sudden displacement caused the

river to rise in a wave 4 or 5 feet high, which rolling down the stream with irresistible force, carried boats, punts, logs of timber, and everything within reach, before it. Fortunately nobody was in a boat near the spot at the time, or he certainly must have been capsized, and perhaps drowned."

15. FATAL ACCIDENT TO AN AERONAUT.—As part of an evening's amusement a professional *aéronaut*, a Mr. Hall, ascended in a balloon from the Cricket-ground, Newcastle-on-Tyne, in the presence of a large concourse of spectators. The ascent took place at 10 minutes to 7, and a quarter past that hour the balloon was seen to descend rapidly in the neighbourhood of Boldon, about 7 miles from Newcastle, and fell in a clover-field. It appears, that as the balloon ascended it passed into a transverse current of air, which rapidly whirled the machine towards the German Ocean. With the purpose of descending somewhat, the *aéronaut* opened the valve, and discharged a quantity of gas. It seems, however, from his incoherent expressions during his subsequent delirium, that his terror of being carried to sea deprived him of presence of mind. He discharged so much gas that the car struck the earth several times, canting out a large part of the ballast, and throwing the unhappy man into the nettings. Being thus released from part of its weight the balloon rose, and Mr. Hall attempted to regain the car. In this he failed, and fell a considerable distance to the earth; where he was found so greatly injured that he died in the infirmary.

16. ARISTOCRATIC ALLIANCES.—A very amusing illustration of the passion for rank at any cost, which is often to be found in the middle ranks of English society, has recently been brought before the public.

At the Lambeth Police Court, a lady of good address, not *very* young, applied to the sitting magistrate for advice respecting the conduct of her husband. Upon being asked the name of this delinquent gentleman, she stated him to be—she could not tell who or what, nor even spell his name. He was, she believed, a young nobleman, the Hon. —. Amid much laughter the lady retired to find her marriage-certificate, whereby to ascertain her acquired name. On another day, the young aristocrat—a person of thin shabby-genteel appearance, with a thin half-fledged moustache on his upper lip, was placed at the bar; and not only did the original complainant appear, but a second lady who had equal claims on William Marshall, William Denbigh Sloper Marshall, otherwise the Hon. William Denbigh Sloper Marshall Harrison. The facts elicited were these:—

On the 28th of September the original complainant, Mrs. Jane Hayes, was conducted to the hymeneal altar at St. George's, Hanover Square, by the Hon. William Denbigh Sloper Harrison, the son of a nobleman, and an officer in the army. She lived with him for a time. But a small black cloud arose on the horizon, and soon darkened the brilliant sky of the Hon. Mrs. Sloper Harrison's honeymoon. She began to suspect that there was a slight hitch in that gay young

nobleman's domestic arrangements, and, in point of fact, there was another Hon. Mrs. Sloper Harrison still extant and breathing vital air. This was bad enough, but far worse remained behind. Had the Lothario been a real officer and a nobleman, the bitter pill of bigamy might have been digested; but it turned out that he was neither the one or the other. So far from being an officer, it proved that the young aristocrat's only connexion with the military force of the country was that he had a brother in the Militia, and in the somewhat humble though honourable capacity of a private. In the next place, what noble family was there of the name of Harrison? The *Peerage* was searched in vain. It was then discovered that the young nobleman was sometimes known by the name of Marshall—just as we might say Hamilton and Brandon. Neither under this head could anything to his advantage be discovered. The noble family still remained a mystery. Something positive, however, was at last brought to light by the discovery—first, of the fact that the young nobleman had recently amused his leisure by accepting jobs as a journeyman paperhanger; and, secondly, that the lady who had prior claims on him as his wife was actually forthcoming. Both ladies were present at Lambeth Police Court on Thursday last, when the pseudo-nobleman was committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court on a charge of bigamy. He seems to have been a pitiful vagabond of the Uriah Heep order when it came to the point, at one moment denouncing

himself as a blackguard and scoundrel—so far the Court was with him—and the next wanting to go down on his knees to his wives, or to anybody who wished to have his boots licked by such a paltry vagabond. "I am very sorry, sir. I know it was very wicked of me—very wicked indeed. I do, sir; I know it was very wicked," said the accused, with a deprecating whine. There seems, indeed, to be a probability that there is a third wife living, inasmuch as the prisoner protested, "that, as God was above him, and his Judge," he had not any third lady to whom he stood in that relation. This form of language in the mouths of such people is almost invariably evidence of falsehood. The Hon. Sloper Marshall was, however, removed at last to prison to await his trial at the Central Criminal Court, begging the spectators not to laugh at him, "because they themselves might get into a hobble some day or other." The scoundrel on his trial threw a shameful imputation on his victim, which was unquestionably without foundation. He was very deservedly sentenced to 5 years' penal servitude.

21. RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES AT ST. GEORGE'S-IN-THE-EAST.—For some time the parish church of St. George's-in-the-East has been the scene of disturbances of a nature utterly discreditable to both parties, and painful to every Christian mind. This parish, which has a population consisting of persons engaged in the shipping trade and manufactures—by no means highly educated and not at all open to High Church influences—has the mis-

fortune to have for its rector the Rev. Bryan King, a clergyman of ultra-Roman tendencies, and who has gone even beyond his contemporaries in his display of bowings, genuflexions, and crossings; in flowers, embroidery, and vestments. He assembles also at his services numerous clergymen unattached, has a choir, "intones" the services, and chants wherever chants can be introduced. He also (of course) adopts the unseemly practice of turning his back upon his congregation whenever he can; and on days when there are no distinct directions in the rubric as to his dress, has devised extraordinary vestments of green. Besides the rector and his assistants, the parish is endowed with a "lecturer" who derives his authority from some other source. This gentleman's views of church services are diametrically opposed to those of the rector. The extraordinary proceedings of the latter have long attained unfavourable notoriety, and have excited a religious war in the parish. Those opposed to the rector adhered to the lecturer, and they accused the former of so arranging the services as to deprive the latter of his fair opportunities. At last the discontent assumed the form of outward violence. At the afternoon service of Sunday, August 21, the lecturer, the Rev. Hugh Allen, alluded to the Church of Rome and its admirers in terms which were supposed to point to the rector and his proceedings. A considerable part of the congregation did not quit the church at the conclusion of the service,

but awaited the commencement of the rector's service; when, with the assistance of persons who came to church on hearing that mischief was brewing, they accompanied the curate's readings with hisses, coughing, and spitting, and caused great confusion. The example was now given, and on the subsequent Sundays the church was crowded with irreverent persons who, under pretext of care for religion, disgraced its solemn services with every manner of outrage. The most of these were persons of no religion at all; many were Dissenters, who had no concern in the matter; the most unabashed disturbers were lads and girls. These persons beset the church before the doors were opened, and occupied the most conspicuous places, the stairs of the reading desk and pulpit, the edges of the pews, and the gas-standards. The favourite game was to occupy the "stalls" set apart for the choristers and assistants around the altar, and shoulder off their proper occupants. The officiating ministers were mobbed, and their readings accompanied by unpleasant noises. When the Psalms and responses were *chanted*, the congregation *read* with stentorian lungs, the "Amens" were shouted in ridiculous tones, followed by loud laughter. When the ministers left the church they were hustled and spit upon, and the choristers departed, "running the gauntlet" of kicks. The rector was no ways moved from his courses by these demonstrations, and called upon his churchwardens to keep order in the church. These unfortunate gentlemen could, of course, do little

to stay the war between parties whose chief quality was an obstinate persistence in doing all they could to annoy each other. They sought the assistance of the civil powers; policemen were stationed about the church, and the unseemly spectacle was exhibited of the religious services of God performed under the inspection of a division of police. And little more than "inspection" it could be; for unless where some overt act of violence was committed, these functionaries had no power to interfere—brawling in church is an ecclesiastical, not a civil, offence.

The interference of the Bishop was invoked. But even the ecclesiastical power could not do much. Such things as lay within his immediate jurisdiction, the reverend prelate did—such as forbidding the use of unusual vestments—the rest not having been express subjects of Church legislation, some not subjects for any legislation whatever—were beyond his power. The right reverend prelate's letter, however, was framed with such sound sense and Christian feeling—his rebukes of the follies of both sides, so just and so conciliatory—that it did not fail of temporary effect. As, however, the rector limited his compliance to what was matter of express injunction, and continued all that was not forbidden, and the discontented repeated their indecorous protests under such shapes as were difficult to grasp, the scandal again became flagrant; and the police-court frequently presented the unseemly spectacle of foolish men brought under the cognizance of the civil magistrate for religious misconduct.

22. SALE OF THE PROPERTIES OF VAUXHALL GARDENS.—The site of this famous and once fashionable place of amusement having been lotted out for building purposes, the "properties" and other effects on the grounds were this day disposed of by auction. As "The Royal Gardens, Vauxhall," have for many years undergone a gradual decline from the height of fashion to near the lowest point of vulgarity and disrepute, and had become almost forgotten, it would not have been desirable, but for its historical renown, to chronicle the final dispersion of its miserable and "seedy" relics. The articles, which were divided into 274 lots, were of the meanest description, and were bought by the lowest of dealers, at the lowest conceivable prices.

25. THUNDERSTORM. — *House struck by Lightning.*—During a storm which broke fiercely over the west-end of the metropolis, more particularly over the district of Maida Hill and Kilburn, the lightning struck the house, No. 16, Lanark Villas, in the Clifton Road. At 10 minutes past 10 A.M. a most vivid forked-flash illuminated the whole district. The electric fluid struck the roof of this house and completely destroyed it; the slates and the brickwork of the main chimney were dashed down and scattered over the pavement. The electric fluid then passed down the chimney into the kitchen, scattering bricks and soot in all directions, knocking over the furniture, and breaking the glass. The lightning appeared at the same moment to occupy the other rooms of the house, which appeared to be in a blaze of vivid

fire. Two ladies and a servant, who were within at the time, rushed forth in an agony of terror and escaped without injury.

26. CAPTURE OF SCHAMYL, THE CIRCASSIAN CHIEF.—The celebrated Circassian leader, Schamyl, who for so many years has maintained the independence of his native mountains, has been at last taken prisoner by the Russians, and sent to St. Petersburg. It appears that the Russian commander, Prince Bariatinski, had invaded the mountains with a force so irresistible, that Schamyl, after suffering a defeat, had withdrawn into his stronghold at Gounil, where he endeavoured to make opportunities by illusory negotiations. The Russian commander took measures to surround the *âoul*, which was a mountain-hold of extraordinary natural strength. The most accessible side had been fortified by all the skill of rude art, and the Circassians had shown themselves so desperate in defending such places, that that side was thought approachable only by regular siege works. The other sides were so strong by nature that Schamyl had entrusted them merely to a small post of observation. It was on one of these sides that the Russians hoped to take the *doul* by surprise. There rose in front of the position three pointed needles of rock, which, if they could be ascended, would command the points of the *plateau* which overhung a narrow pass. A body of volunteers succeeded in surmounting these pinnacles in an early morning fog, and by their fire enabled another body, who had been concealed in broken

ground at the foot of the rock, to rush up the pass, and obtain a firm footing on the *plateau*. The position was now scaled on various points, and the desultory resistance of the Circassians overcome. The *âoul* was then surrounded. But Schamyl and his faithful Murides (body guard) about 400 in number, offered the most desperate resistance. A body of these resolute men, posted in a wood, finding that there was no chance for flight, threw themselves on the Russians, sword and dagger in hand, and perished to the last man. Schamyl himself, with his family and a few Murides, were in the *âoul*, which was surrounded by a strong chain of troops. The Russian officers ordered the firing to cease, and sent officers to Schamyl entreating him to forbear a fruitless resistance, and to spare his family and the inhabitants of the *âoul* the horrors of an assault. After a negotiation of two hours, seeing that resistance was indeed vain, Schamyl came forth from a house, sculptured out of the hollow rock, and surrendered. Schamyl and his eldest son were immediately sent to St. Petersburg, and it is believed that the illustrious captive was treated with the utmost generosity.

The resistance of the Caucasians to the Russian arms has been continued for half a century; but this event will probably bring about the surrender of the whole district.

28. BRILLIANT AURORA BOREALIS.—Among the wonders of this extraordinary summer may be recorded the most brilliant displays of *Aurora Borealis* that have been known in these latitudes. On the evening of August

28th this phenomenon was singularly beautiful. "From 8.40 P.M. until 9 P.M.," says Mr. Lowe, writing from Beeston observatory, "curtains of red light were visible near the zenith. By 11.40 P.M. the glare of orange light in the north was powerful enough (even through much cloud) to make the hands of a watch visible. From midnight, for three-quarters of an hour, the sky was overcast; yet at 12.25 A.M. the light emitted was so strong that it gave the impression of daylight. The clouds in west and north-west were inky black. At 12.45 an opening (in the clouds) near the zenith disclosed the cupola, which was situated exactly on Alpha Andromedæ; this star being in an open space, surrounded by a white circle, or more frequently by an ever-changing mass of wavy streams of light. In a few minutes again overcast, and remaining so till 1.10, when the clouds began to clear off. At 1.15 A.M. magnificent rays of light met 2° east of Alpha Andromedæ, where a wing-shaped mass of Aurora was situated; each ray as it approached this spot became 'bended.' At this time three-fourths of the sky were covered with Aurora. In the north-north-west there was a long black cloud-like line, which travelled slowly eastward. At 1.25 A.M. its south end was passing across Capella, which star shone brightly through it. From 1.30 till 2.30 much cloud. At 2.30, there being more clear sky, a splendid mass of Aurora Borealis was visible, forming an ever-changing cupola close to Gamma Trianguli; 3.15 less bright. All the coruscations moved slowly eastward. The

VOL. CI.

wind south till 1.30 A.M., then south-west." Other phenomena were noticed during the splendour of the Aurora, particularly the remarkable brightness of the Pleiades, and other heavenly bodies; analogous to the increased brilliancy of Arcturus, while the tail of the comet passed over it last year.

There has been at this time also observed a remarkable chain of spots over the sun.

30. EXPLOSION ON BOARD H.M.S. "PIONEER."—About 1 P.M. a bad accident occurred on board H.M.S. steam-sloop *Pioneer*, at anchor in Plymouth Sound. The ship was getting up steam, in order to proceed into Hamoaze when the steam-pipe burst. The engine-room was instantly filled with steam, and the engineers and stokers were dreadfully scalded; seven very badly. One died.

INDIAN AND RUSSIAN LOANS.—The Indian and Russian Governments have appeared as borrowers almost simultaneously in the money-market. The amount proposed to be raised by Russia is in the whole 12,000,000*l.*; but of this 4,000,000*l.* only was offered in the English market, the remainder being retained for the continent and the native capitalists. The loan was to be a 3 per cent. stock, to be tendered for at the price of 66½. The tenders fell somewhat short of the sum required, and not more than 100,000*l.* was taken on the Stock Exchange. The loan negotiated by the Indian Government was 5,000,000*l.*, and the readiness with which it was taken up shows that, notwithstanding the security offered is the Indian revenue only, unguaranteed by the State, that that

K

empire has just emerged from a fearful rebellion—that it has already borrowed near 25,000,000*l.* within three years and that its revenue accounts exhibit a frightful defect of income compared with the expenditure, the credit of the India dependency is equal to the credit of the Russian Empire. The loan was a 5 per cent. stock. The tenders at and above 97 amounted to 5,824,750*l.* As 97 was the *minimum* fixed by the Council, the whole loan was taken at one sitting. The price in the market immediately rose to 98½. There were tenders to the amount of 2,500,000*l.* slightly below the *minimum*.

SALE OF LORD NORTHWICK'S PICTURES.—The late Lord Northwick was, from his earliest years, distinguished for his love of art, and had spent the best part of a long life and a vast fortune in the selection and purchase of works of the highest stamp in every department of taste. His picture gallery, in particular, was distinguished for the richness of its contents—unequalled, perhaps, as a collection commenced and completed in the life of one man, and by the exercise of his own judgment. If Lord Northwick's taste rarely failed, on the other hand his judgment was not infallible. Hence, his gallery was remarkable for its many undoubted and authentic pictures, and equally so for the great number of excellent but doubtful works. One merit it certainly possessed without detraction—the selection exhibited remarkable taste and judgment in the adscription of the several works to the right schools—no small excellence in a gallery. His lordship's principal residence,

Northwick Hall, near Cheltenham, was too limited to contain the increasing collection. Other houses were taken and filled; and finally his lordship purchased Thirlestane House, Cheltenham, as the final resting-place of his beloved treasures. This fine mansion was open with great freedom to all lovers of art, whether connoisseurs or pleasure-seekers, and was one of the greatest attractions of that fashionable watering-place. It was hoped, that at Lord Northwick's decease, his gallery, or at least a judiciously-selected portion of it, would have been bequeathed to the nation. Unfortunately his lordship died intestate, his title and landed estates passed to his nephew, and the personality, including his collection of pictures and works of art and *virtu*, became the property of his next of kin. The present lord, desirous of preserving the gallery intact, offered to the administrators a considerable sum for the whole; the offer was refused, and the world of art—for the fame of the collection was universal—became animated by the announcement that the whole would be sold by auction in the months of July and August.

The catalogue contained not fewer than 1881 pictures. They were works of the most renowned masters of every school Italian, Spanish, French, and Flemish—of the English school not only were there the names of the most eminent artists, but some of the works were the finest from their hand. There were, in addition, a fine collection of gems (many from the famous Poniatowski cabinets), miniatures, enamels, bronzes, choice examples of

Majolica and other ceramic ware, and Oriental art. The sale was to occupy the space from the 26th of July to the 30th of August. Perhaps never before—or never since the sale of the King of Holland's gallery—was there ever known such an assemblage of noble connoisseurs, men of judgment in art, or professionals representing foreign princes or millionnaires. Space renders it impracticable to give anything like a detailed account of the competition for the best works; a few only have been selected for record, and those chiefly because of the large sums they produced—for very many pictures of inappreciable value in the history of art, being very much matter of antiquarian or practical interest, were not sold for sums relatively large.

Second day:—Mazzolino di Ferrari, "Christ in the Judgment-Hall," 320 *gs.*; Weenix, "Garden of a Château," 350 *gs.*; Van Eyck, "Adoration of the Magi" (the gem of the whole collection), 495 *gs.*; Canaletto, "Grand Canal at Venice," 400 *gs.*

Third day:—Gonzales Coques, "A Group of Family Portraits," 300 *gs.*

Fourth day (English Masters):—Nasmyth's "View in Leigh Woods," 750*l.*; Linnel, "Landscape," 875 *gs.*; Lawrence, "William Pitt," 140*l.*; Calcott, "Mill-pond, with water-wheel," 250*l.*; Webster, "Dunce punished," 1005*l.*; Mulready, "The Convalescent from Waterloo," 1180 *gs.*

Fifth day:—Claude, "Dairy-Farm in Holland," 510*l.*; G. Poussin, "Landscape," 330 *gs.*; Murillo, "Jacob placing the rods before Laban's Sheep," 1410 *gs.*

Sixth day:—Guido, "Angel ap-

pearing to St. Jerome," 350 *gs.*; P. Perugino, "Virgin and Child," 350 *gs.*; Conegliano, "St. Catherine," 800 *gs.*; Girolano da Treviso, "The Virgin," 450 *gs.* (for the National Gallery); Lorenzo di Credi, "Holy Family," 500 *gs.*; Giulio Romano, "Birth of Jupiter," 929*l.* (for the National Gallery); Jan Bellini, "Holy Family," 300 *gs.*

Seventh day (gems, miniatures, ceramic ware, &c.):—Miniatures—Cooper, "Dr. Bate," 31 *gs.*; Holbein, "Sir John Gage," 61 *gs.*; Zincke, "Sir R. Walpole," 30 *gs.*; Hilliard, "Lady Jane Grey," 125 *gs.*; Cooper, "John Hampden," in armour, 51 *gs.*; Raffaele ware—a magnificent dish, with "Martyrdom of St. Lawrence," monogram G. O. B. O. (Guido Baldi) date 1581, 295 *gs.*; Cameo, "Triumph of Bacchus" (from Poniatowski gems), 75 *gs.*

Eighth day:—Antique gems—Minerva and Apollo observing Nestor," cameo of three strata (Poniatowski) 27 *gs.*; "Aurora," two strata, (do.) 31*l.*; pair of Oriental jars and covers, 4½ feet high, 105 *gs.*; Miniatures—Holbein, "Louis XII.," 96 *gs.*; Oliver, "Wycherly," 64 *gs.*; Cranach, "Martin Luther," 50 *gs.*; Oliver, "Lady Digby," 100 *gs.*; Cooper, "Richard Cromwell," 80 *gs.*

Tenth day:—Titian, "Pope Paul III.," 101 *gs.*; N. Poussin, "Venus appearing to Æneas," 240 *gs.*; Giorgione, "Cupid wounded prefers his complaint to Venus," 1250 *gs.*; Titian, "Tarquin and Lucretia," 395 *gs.*; Velasquez, "Don Louis de Haro," 920 *gs.*

Eleventh day:—Teniers, "Village Fête," 250 *gs.*; B. Luini, "Virgin and Saviour," 200 *gs.*; Moretto, "Glorification of the

Virgin," 550 *gs.* (for the National Gallery); Salvator Rosa, "L'Umana Fragilita," 330 *gs.*; Massaccio, "Himself," 103 *gs.*

Twelfth day (English Masters):—Creswick, "Mountain Stream," 350 *gs.*; Redgrave, "Flight into Egypt," 350 *gs.*; Danby, "Wood-Nymph chanting her Hymn to the Rising Sun," 360 *gs.*; Roberts, "Interior of Westminster Abbey," 315 *gs.*; S. Cooper, "Meadow Scene, cattle and sheep," 455 *gs.*; Müller, "View of Athens," 520 *gs.*; MacIise, "Robin Hood and his Foresters," 1305 *gs.*; Wilson, "Cicero's Villa," 300 *gs.*; E. W. Cooke, "Sea View," 310 *gs.*; Goodall, "Departure of the Norman Conscript," 630 *gs.*; Leslie, "Columbus and the Egg," 1070 *gs.*; Frost, "Diana and Nymphs," 675 *gs.*; Nasmyth, "Windsor Castle," 560 *gs.*; Poole, "Job," 610 *gs.*; Ward, "Disgrace of Clarendon," 805 *gs.*; MacIise, "Marriage of Strongbow and Eva," 1710 *gs.*

Fifteenth day:—Cuyp, "Count D'Egmont," 300 *gs.*; Velasquez, "Don John of Austria," 130 *gs.*; Wouvermans, "Miseries of War," 1035 *gs.*; G. G. Bellini, "Mahomet II.," 185 *gs.*

Sixteenth day:—Fra Bartolomeo, "Virgin, Child, and St. John," 510 *gs.*; Cuyp, "Landscape, with portraits," 920 *gs.*; Enamels by Bone, "Holy Family," after Raffaele, 180 *gs.*; "Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk," after Holbein, 110 *gs.*; "Earls of Bedford and Bristol," after Van Dyk, 151 *gs.*; "Lady Jane Grey," after Holbein, 120 *gs.*; "Lady Hamilton as Ariadne," after Madame Le Brun—this exquisite work brought the enormous sum of 700 *gs.*

Seventeenth day:—Schidone, "Girl with Hornbook," 405 *gs.*;

Teniers, "The Alchymist," 675 *gs.*; Guercino, "Samson and the Honeycomb," 390 *gs.*; do., "Christ and the Woman of Samaria," 505 *gs.*; Giorgione, "Musical Party," 750 *gs.*; Carlo Dolci, "St. John," 2010 *gs.*; Garofalo, "Stoning of St. Stephen," 1530 *gs.*

On the eighteenth day the dispersion of this wonderful collection was completed, the sums obtained amounting in the aggregate to 95,725*l.* There yet remain to be disposed of the furniture, linen, wines, &c., of this mansion, which had for so many years been the casket of such an accumulation of the highest productions of human art. The produce of the several days' sale was as follows:—

First day.	£3,750
Second day	4,400
Third day	3,300
Fourth day	7,000
Fifth day	7,500
Sixth day	6,250
Seventh day	1,785
Eighth day	1,665
Ninth day	3,600
Tenth day	6,320
Eleventh day	5,450
Twelfth day	16,500
Thirteenth day	1,036
Fourteenth day	910
Fifteenth day	5,300
Sixteenth day	6,100
Seventeenth day	10,575
Eighteenth day	4,284
	<hr/>
	£95,725

EXTRAORDINARY PERFORMANCES AT NIAGARA.—M. Blondin, a tight-rope dancer, has performed feats over the mighty Falls of Niagara, partaking so much of the marvellous that many persons believe the man and his exploits to be altogether mythical. The main

facts, however, appear to be so well attested, that they deserve mention as a record of extraordinary folly. The wagers which this person had offered in the public papers had drawn to him a considerable notoriety; it was known that a tight-rope had been stretched over the most dangerous part of the rapids beneath the Falls, and, in consequence, on the day of the first performance, some 10,000 persons had been drawn thither to witness the result. On the 17th August M. Blondin proved that he had not made his boast on insufficient grounds. Despite the fearful nature of the chasm below—where one failure of nerve, one slip, one unexpected obstacle would have resulted in a terrible death—and despite the slender line on which his existence depended, M. Blondin went through his task with perfect ease and success. He ran along the rope, crawled along it like an ape, stood with his head on it, swung from it by two feet, by one foot; and finally, carried a man across it on his shoulders. On another occasion, he crossed in manacles!—a collar about his neck, a chain pendant to his arms and two others from his wrists to his ancles. On his return he carried on his back, a portable cooking-stove, with saucepan, ladles, dishes, and a pair of bellows. Arrived at the lowest point, he rested his stove on the rope, lit his fire, blew it up with his bellows, produced eggs, and in a few minutes cooked an *omelette*, which he let down by a rope to the deck of a steam-boat below, by whose passengers it was eaten and pronounced excellent. On subsequent days M. Blondin performed exploits more

extraordinary—such as walking across and returning blindfolded by a sack drawn over his head—but the narratives in the American papers are so exalted that it is difficult to select the veritable from the trickery. These foolhardy exhibitions drew an immense number of visitors, whose travelling expenses greatly enriched the railway companies, by whom it is probable the whole affair was got up and puffed into notoriety.

RESIDENCE OF THE COURT AT BALMORAL.—Her Majesty and the Prince Consort, with the Royal Family, left Osborne early on the morning of the 29th August; reached Buckingham Palace at 1 P.M.; started for the North at 8.30 P.M.; and travelling all night, reached Edinburgh at 8.0 A.M. of the following day, which was passed at the Palace of Holyrood. At 6 P.M. of the following day they arrived at Balmoral. Nothing occurred during the residence of the Court at this place to distinguish it from the ordinary rustication of a great family. Her Majesty returned to Edinburgh on the 13th October; and having bestowed the honour of Knighthood upon the Lord Provost, the Right Hon. John Melville, proceeded to Penrhyn Castle, near Bangor, the magnificent seat of Colonel Douglas Pennant, M.P. The Prince Consort went to Holyhead and inspected the *Great Eastern*, which was lying at anchor there on her trial voyage. The Court thence returned direct to Osborne.

SEPTEMBER.

6. **EXTENSIVE ROBBERIES.**—A gentleman connected with the Globe Iron Works at Rochdale, received from a customer at Heywood's Bank 1200*l.* in twelve notes of 100*l.*, which he placed in an outer skirt-pocket of his great-coat. When he arrived at the Exchange he found his valuable charge gone. The thief got clear off.

A short time previous a customer of a country bank—a man in embarrassed circumstances—took advantage of the momentary absence of the manager, to step into the back parlour, and take 600*l.* from the safe.

— **SERIOUS BOAT ACCIDENT IN IRELAND.**—There was a regatta at Glandore, on the coast of Cork, at which numerous persons from the small stations around were present in small boats of various descriptions. One of these, carrying ten or eleven persons, was on its return to Rathbarry, when it was struck by a sea, and every person on board perished.

On the 25th September several persons went on board a small yacht, belonging to a resident of Limerick, and went for a sail on the Lower Shannon. By some mismanagement the yacht capsized. Four of the voyagers reached the shore in a very exhausted condition; but four others were drowned.

7. **FATAL FIRE IN THE WATERLOO ROAD.**—Early in the morning a fire, which caused the death of three persons, occurred in the immediate neighbourhood of the Waterloo Railway Station. The house was occupied by Mr. Burton, a dealer in unredeemed pledges, with his wife and five

sons and daughters; one of the latter was absent. The house is three stories high, exclusive of an attic. Mr. and Mrs. Burton slept in the front room on the second floor, two daughters slept in the back room, three sons in the attic. The fire was first discovered a few minutes before 4 o'clock by a policeman, who immediately gave the alarm and then ran for assistance. When an opposite neighbour, aroused from sleep by the alarm of fire, first looked out of his window, he saw Mrs. Burton for a few moments standing at the open second-floor front window in her night-dress, calling for help. Flames had not then broken out in any part of the house, though smoke was issuing from the open window at which she stood. She then disappeared. The attic window led into a deep gutter on the roof not more than seven or eight inches wide at the bottom, but widening upwards, by the backward slope of the roof. On emerging from the attic on to the roof there is a parapet wall facing the street, so high that a grown-up person standing in the gutter cannot see over it. On either hand, too, the partition walls dividing the premises from the two adjacent houses are of such a height as to render the attempt to surmount them one of great difficulty. As the fire was below, the family ran up to the roof, anticipating escape onto the next houses. Unfortunately, the opening of the windows at the first alarm, and now the opening of the attic doors, had caused so strong a draught that the flames rushed up the staircase and followed the fugitives to the very gutters. Here there must have been panic-terror, for although

Mr. Burton, and two sons, aged 27 and 17, effected their escape onto the next roofs, they did not give assistance to the females. When the fire had been extinguished, the dead bodies of Mrs. Burton and her daughter were found at the bottom of the gutter on which the attic window emerges, and so closely wedged together that it was found necessary to cut away some part of the roof before they could be extricated. Another son, 10 years of age, was also discovered burnt to death just within the attic window.

8. ACCIDENT ON THE GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.—A collision, attended with serious consequences, occurred near Hitchin, on the Great Northern Railway. At about 400 yards north of the Hitchin station there is a "junction" with a branch of the Midland line, so arranged that in order to get upon the Great Northern "up" line it must cross over the "down" line upon a level. The Great Northern express train for Edinburgh left King's Cross at 9.15 P.M. and reached its first stopping place, Hitchin, at 10.5, or about two minutes behind time. It consisted of several carriages of all classes, which carried a considerable number of passengers. On that evening the Midland train from Leicester, which was due at Hitchin Junction at 9.35 did not arrive until near half-an-hour after that time. There is near the junction a lofty box which commands both lines, and is in charge of two experienced signal-men, who manage the course of traffic at that point. The Midland train signals its approach by loud whistles, and it is the duty of the engine-driver not to attempt to run on to the Great Northern line until the

signal man on duty telegraphs that all is clear. In like manner the engine men of the Great Northern trains signify their starting from the station by whistles, and ought not to proceed until they see the signal of safety. The telegraphic signs are kept at "danger," and no train ought to proceed until this sign is changed for that indicating safety. From what neglect the present catastrophe arose does not sufficiently appear. But the express train had left the station, and was just passing the junction, when the Midland train dashed into it with a terrific crash. Fortunately the engine did not strike the passenger carriages, but the engine, and the mischief that ensued was due to the impetus of the following carriages. The engine of the express train was disabled, and the third and fourth carriages crushed. About 86 of the passengers received injuries, more or less severe. Seven were so seriously hurt that they were conveyed to Hitchin. Among these were the wife of Dr. Milner, fractured ribs; and the Rev. P. Kelland, Professor of Mathematics, Edinburgh University, compound fracture of ankle; and Mr. Tidmarsh, leg fractured. The other injured passengers either proceeded on their journey, or returned to London. The guard also was seriously injured. The Midland train suffered little injury, and of its fourteen passengers, two were slightly hurt.

18. DONCASTER RACES.—The great meeting of the autumnal racing season drew an immense concourse of visitors, and resulted, to the great gratification of the Yorkshiremen, in the unexpected victory of the north over the south. On Tuesday the Champagne

Stakes were won by Baron Rothschild's "King of Diamonds;" the Great Yorkshire Handicap (22 starters) by Mr. Prout's "Paul." The great event of the "meet" was, of course, the St. Leger Stakes, for which Mr. W. Day's "Promised Land," the winner of the Goodwood Cup was favourite without a second. The odds at starting were on "Promised Land," 5 to 4, 4 to 1 against "Summerside," 20 to 1 against Sir C. Monck's "Gamester." To the astonishment of all present "Gamester" came out and won easily by half-a-length, the favourite coming in fifth: 167 subscribers; 11 started. On Thursday the Doncaster Cup was won by Lord Stamford's "Newcastle."

14. THE GREAT EASTERN.—The public expectation, which had been fixed with a great interest upon the proceedings of the *Great Eastern*, was gratified by the intelligence that the monster ship had safely accomplished the first and a difficult part of her voyages—the passage from the Thames. Early on Wednesday morning, all the arrangements for unmooring having been completed, four powerful steam-tugs were lashed alongside, and two attached by long hawsers to her bows. Anchors were suspended at various points, ready to be cut loose the moment any difficulty should arise. Two hours before high water the signal was given to let slip the moorings, and the huge chains rushed through the hawse holes with a noise like thunder, and emitting a perfect blaze of sparks, and in a few moments the ship glided majestically from her berth. At the narrow and difficult turn at Blackwall it was feared she might run aground, in which event her vast length would

have closed the whole navigation; but she answered her helm perfectly, and avoided the danger with ease. She then glided forward, without apparent effort, to Purfleet, where, owing to the set of the tide, it was thought prudent to bring her up. On Thursday she resumed her progress, and was towed to Sea Reach, where the tugs cast off, and the great ship was left to her own powers of propulsion. She reached the Nore Light, steaming at the rate of 15 miles an hour. The voyage round the Forelands on the following morning gave the first proof of what the *Great Eastern* could do in a sea way. The breeze was fresh, and right ahead, with a heavy swell; large vessels were lying to under close reefed topsails, pitching deeply into the sea and sending the spray in clouds from their bows. The *Great Eastern*, however, was as motionless as a rock. As huge seas rolled by her their effect could only be known by observing their influence on other vessels. Several of the fast steamers belonging to Dover and Ramsgate came out to view her; but after tossing wildly about in vain efforts to approach her were glad to turn round and run for shelter. Thus far the first voyage of the *Great Eastern* had been a decided success. When the ship had passed Dungeness and Beachy Head the visitors on board, who were either men of science connected with steam navigation, or persons otherwise of note, sat down to dinner. The weather now began to clear; some of the gentlemen went on deck to have a look at Hastings, others followed, and instead of retiring to the grand saloon as usual, also came on deck and went forward to the

bows; thus, by a most merciful interposition, for the first time during the voyage there was no one sitting in the grand saloon, or on the little raised deck on the foremost funnel—for at this moment there was a terrific explosion—the fore part of the deck appeared to spring like a mine, blowing the funnel up into the air. There was a confused heavy roar, amid which came the awful crash of timber and iron mingled together with frightful uproar, and then all was hidden in a rush of steam. Blinded and almost stunned by the overwhelming concussion, those on the bridge stood motionless in the white vapour till they were reminded of the necessity of seeking shelter by the shower of wreck—glass, gilt work, saloon ornaments, and pieces of wood, which began to fall like rain in all directions. The prolonged clatter of these as they fell prevented any one aft the bridge from moving, and though all knew that a fearful accident had occurred, none were aware of its extent or what was likely next to happen; all that could be ascertained was that the vessel's sides were uninjured, and the engines still going. The explosion had taken place in the forward funnel which passes through the grand saloon and lower deck cabins, the former of which had a few minutes before held the guests assembled round the festive board. Gradually, then, as the steam cleared off, the foremost funnel could be seen lying like a log across the deck, which was covered with bits of glass, gilding, fragments of curtains and silk hangings, window frames, scraps of wood blown into splinters, and a mass of

fragments, which had evidently come from the cabin fittings of the lower deck, beneath the grand saloon. In the middle was a great heap of rubbish where the funnel had just stood, from which the condensed steam was rushing up in a white, and therefore not hot vapour, but enough to hide completely all that happened below. Captain Harrison was the first to descend through the mass of heated vapours and burning fragments into the cabins below. Through the yawning apertures that had been formed in the ship's lower decks by the blast, the bright glare beneath the lower deck of all showed that the furnace doors had either been blown open or blown away, and the funnel being gone, the draught was down the remains of the chimney, forcing out the flames and ashes in a fierce and dangerous stream. This, as the embers touched water, sent up a close suffocating air—half steam, half gas—in which it was difficult to see and almost impossible to breathe. The other boilers might be equally dangerous. Mr. Scott Russell, followed by one or two engineers, at once went below to the furnaces, and ordered the steam to be blown off, the speed of the engines to be reduced, and every precaution taken to guard against mishap. Mr. Campbell (the Chairman of the Company) remained calm and collected on deck, getting the crew forward and preventing any unnecessary alarm. Some of the men instantly went below to search for those employed in the stoke-holes, whom it was now evident must be fearfully injured, if indeed alive. It proved that twelve were hurt—scalded in the most fright-

ful manner. Yet, although it was evident that their bodies had been in truth "boiled" by the sudden blast of steam, these poor fellows at first seemed to be little hurt; they walked composedly, and spoke of their hurts with a sleepy cheerfulness. They were instantly conveyed to berths, and every appliance administered that could be supposed to render their position less terrible. But one by one their sufferings were terminated by death. Five perished by this dreadful death; four or five others were dreadfully mangled; one had leapt overboard in his terror and agony, and was lost.

During this period of dismay the engines were kept steadily at work, and the vessel was continued in motion, though her course was for a short time altered towards the shore. At first there appeared some risk that the damage would be extended by fire; for the flames rushed furiously from the furnace doors; but the deck hose was turned on, and in a few minutes all danger from that source was at an end. In the evening the ship was at anchor in Portland Bay.

The consequences of the explosion were indeed terrible. From the peculiar manner in which the ship was built she was divided into compartments by bulk-heads of immense strength—and while this division had confined the explosion to a single compartment, it had thereby intensified its power.

"The litter on the deck showed that in the compartment in which it had taken place, and where it was confined by the wrought-iron bulkheads, it had been wide and general. The fore part of Mr. Grace's beautiful saloon was a

pile of glittering rubbish, a mere confused mass of boards, carpet shreds, hangings, mirrors, gilt frames, and splinters of ornaments; the rich gilt castings were broken and thrown down, the brass work ripped, the handsome cast-iron columns round the funnel overturned and strewed about. In the more forward part, a state sitting-room for ladies, every single thing was destroyed, and the wooden flooring broken and wrenched up. As one gazed on the evidences of the appalling force of the explosion, it was recollected with profound gratitude to Providence that the accident occurred at the only single moment when the grand saloon was empty, and the berths on each side were unoccupied. What the consequences would have been if it had taken place an hour later, when the visitors would be sitting in the saloon, is almost fearful to think upon. But the damage in this part seemed a mere *bagatelle* when compared with the ravages among the lower deck cabins beneath. It was difficult to go down there, for the whole place was filled with fragments of boards, chairs, beds, cabin fittings, broken steam pipes and syphon tubes, torn-out rivets, and masses of the inner and outer funnels rent to pieces like calico, and lying about like heaps of crumpled card-board. Everything was in literal fragments. The course of the explosion could then be seen at once. The water, or rather steam, in the casing had crushed in the inner casing, blowing up the funnel above deck, while both funnels below it were torn to pieces and hurled about, sometimes in single rivets or scraps no longer than one's

hand, sometimes in crumpled-up lumps weighing several hundred-weight. Beneath this deck, towards the stokehole, where the remnants of the funnel left a yawning hole like an extinct volcano, the force of the explosion was still more manifest. Not only was the iron compartment nearest to the boiler partly rent and pushed back, but one of the main-deck beams, an enormously massive wrought-iron girder, about 2 feet deep, and strengthened with angle irons, was wrenched back, and nearly bent in halves. . . . In some parts the explosion seems to have acted with the capricious violence of lightning. Thus, in the grand saloon, the two largest mirrors on each side of it, running fore and aft were quite unbroken, though the silvering was boiled off the backs of both by the heat of the steam. By the side of these glasses cast-iron columns were bent and broken, and mirrors at four times the distance from the seat of the disaster were almost pulverized, and their framings even destroyed. The beautiful oak staircases descending to the saloons were blown up like cardwork, yet not a book on the library shelves close to the funnel was stirred. . . . Every engineer on board knows that no wooden vessel that ever swam could have resisted the tremendous violence of the explosion for a second. Whether it had happened to the *Royal Albert* or the *General Admiral*, the result would have been in each case the same; they would have gone down, perhaps without even time enough to lower a boat. . . . Any ordinary vessel, even those nominally built of iron, which only

means an outer metal casing with all the rest wood, must have been burnt by the explosion. Yet it is not too much to say that all on board almost smiled at the idea of fire in a vessel subdivided in every direction into a series of iron cells. Had fire been possible, the mass of water that was instantly at hand from large hose connected with the donkey engines would have sufficed to put out a small volcano."

Some idea may be formed of the extent of the mischief when it is stated that the expense of restoration is estimated at 5000*l*.

When the cause of this fearful disaster was investigated, it was found to have arisen from an arrangement which, while perfectly simple in itself, was capable by a single oversight or act of ignorance, of being converted into the most powerful explosive force imagination can conceive. For the double purpose of heating the water before it passed to the boilers, and of keeping the saloons cool, a "jacket," or "feed-pipe casing," had been placed around the lower part of each funnel. The water was pumped into this in the first instance, and after receiving a considerable degree of heat from the inner or chief funnel, was to be passed into the boilers. As no power was to be acquired from the reservoir thus formed, it was intended that the steam which might be raised should pass away through an open pipe, or "stand-pipe," which was not fitted with a safety-valve. But, unfortunately, for some undefined purpose, this pipe had been fitted with a common stop-cock; and this stop-cock, by inadvertence or ignorance, had been turned to

close the pipe. The communication between the casing and the boilers had also been shut off. In consequence, as the water within the casing became heated, and the steam became compressed within, this reservoir was converted into steam, the power of which was increasing from moment to moment, the very strength of the materials contributing to the completeness of the ultimate destruction. The apparatus may, in fact, be likened to a gigantic boiler, without a valve or any means of letting off its steam, save by blowing up. And thus, as the speed of the noble vessel was increased by every fresh addition to the action of her furnaces, the means of destruction were accumulating overhead, until, in the very moment of triumph and exultation, the powers of nature, unthought of and unregulated, asserted their supremacy, and reduced the work of men's hands to a ruin around its artificers.

It appeared, during the subsequent inquiry, that this system of heating the feed-water has been frequently adopted, and though apparently simple, has always been found practically dangerous, and laid aside. Messrs. Bolton and Watt, who constructed the screw-engines of the *Great Eastern*, refused to permit the use of the jacket to their funnels; and consequently they were applied only to the paddle-engines.

The damage done by the explosion having been repaired while the ship lay in Portland harbour, the *Great Eastern* resumed her trial-trip on the 8th of October. As the passage round the Land's End offers the

difficulties of a rough sea, the ship was, for the first time, put on trial. It would be useless here to narrate experiments which time will confirm or negative. It will suffice to state that trials were made with the paddle-wheels alone, with the screw alone, with both combined, and with both combined with a portion of the sails. The trials were deemed satisfactory. The screw alone proved very efficient; the combined power of steam and wind produced a great increase of speed; but the chief result of the experiments was the great accession of momentum gained by the union of the screw and paddles.

The *Great Eastern* took up a berth in Holyhead Harbour; and while lying outside for the purpose of further trials, became exposed to the full fury of the hurricane of the 26th of October. In this terrific storm the ship behaved nobly, but was at one time in considerable danger of being driven ashore.

It may here be further mentioned, that some additional experiments rather disappointed the expectations of her admirers. The paddles proved defective either in power or mode of fitting; the utmost speed attained (under disadvantageous conditions, certainly) fell far short of calculation; it began to be suspected that the power of her engines was not proportioned to her tonnage; and the ship was found to roll considerably. She returned to Southampton, and was berthed for the winter in Southampton water.

17. FIRE IN THE CITY.—DR. JOHNSON'S CLUB.—A fire, which broke out about 8 A.M., destroyed

not only a considerable amount of property, but a house with which interesting associations are connected. The building, which was of considerable extent, and was occupied by several tenants, formed Nos. 3 and 4, Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row. The lower part was occupied by a coffee-shop or eating-house, entitled the "Literary Coffee-House and Reading Rooms." This occupation was in direct descent from a club founded by Dr. Johnson, in 1747, at this house, then known by the sign of the "King's Head." "Thither he constantly resorted, and with a disposition to please and be pleased, he would pass those hours in a free and unconstrained interchange of sentiments, which otherwise would have been spent at home in painful reflection." (*Boswell*.) This club, which was the precursor of the celebrated Literary Club, which met in Gerard Street, Soho, consisted of nine members; namely, Dr. Johnson, the Rev. Dr. Salter, Dr. Hawkesworth, Mr. Ryland, Mr. John Payne, Mr. Samuel Dyer, Dr. W. McGhie, Dr. Edmund Barker, Dr. Richard Bathurst, and Sir John Hawkins.

18. EXTRAORDINARY CHILD STEALING AT PARIS.—The public were somewhat amused by the following advertisement in the appropriate column of the *Times*:—

"Ten thousand francs reward.—The infant son of M. Hua, of 50, Rue Jacob, Paris, having been carried off from the garden of the Tuilleries, at about half-past 1 o'clock on the 16th instant, a reward of 10,000 francs will be given to any one who will restore the child in safety to its father, at the above address. Descrip-

tion:—Age, two months, appearance of body healthy and mottled, without spot or blemish; head pointed; nose well developed; chin small; very little hair, except in a blonde tuft at the back of the head; an appearance of scurf coming to a point at the top of the forehead; complexion fresh; upper eyelashes blonde, long, and fine; lower eyelashes—none; eyes lively and approaching to black; feet long; the fingers frequently spread. Important.—The child was vaccinated on the 13th of August, one scar only appearing on each arm, the marks of which are still plainly visible.—Paris, 18th September, 1849."

The gentleman whose "little darling" had been thus cruelly abstracted is no less a personage than a Judge of the Civil Tribunal. In a few days the child was discovered in the possession of a woman and her daughter at Orleans. As the plot developed itself, a singular scene of French life was presented. The young woman, who was not yet 17, had formed intimate relations with a young workman, her cousin. In the hope of inducing him to marry her she feigned pregnancy; but without effect. As the time passed on and it became necessary to carry the plan forward, the young woman pretended to have been delivered of a male child; and to work upon the feelings of the alleged parent, it became necessary to present a visible offspring to his eyes. She went to the gardens of the Tuilleries, and having fixed upon an interesting and well-dressed child in the arms of its nurse, she most adroitly got possession of it. She was tried for

the offence, which was fully admitted; but her counsel told a tale of heartlessness in her seducer (though in the first instance it was clear that the girl was culpable), as to raise a certain sentiment in the minds of the jury, and they acquitted her.

20. WRECK OF THE JERSEY PACKET "EXPRESS."—The favourite Channel Islands steamer *Express* has been lost from the same cause that has led to the wreck of so many fine steamboats—the desire of the captain to make a short cut. The *Express* left St. Helier's, at 7 A.M., for Guernsey, and Weymouth, under the command of her chief mate. As this was the first day of the Guernsey races, there were a very large number of passengers and three horses on board. In his anxiety to make a short passage, the commander hugged the shore off Jersey so closely that he ran her on the Corbiere rock. She was got off and run ashore in a convenient place, where her passengers were all landed, except three, who, in their anxiety to escape, had attempted to rush into the first boat launched, and had fallen into the sea. The three horses were thrown overboard and swam safe to shore. The *Express* became a wreck.

21. STEAM-ENGINE EXPLOSION AT LEWES.—The introduction of steam into English farms is so recent, that the mind experiences somewhat of a surprise at hearing that a steam-engine has exploded, not in a factory, but at an agricultural show, and that the sufferers are not mechanics or "operatives," but ploughmen and cattle-dealers. At the Lewes Agricultural Show, Messrs. Cheale and Sons exhibited a port-

able engine of 4-horse power, intended to give motion to various kinds of agricultural machines. While the engine was being exhibited in full work, and the spectators were assembled around to witness the performance, the boiler exploded, and dealt death and wounds around. The engineer, a young farmer, and four other persons were killed, and a considerable number wounded. A horse and two sheep were also killed, and probably many more injured. The engine as it burst leapt from the ground and made three somersaults. It crushed through a sheep-pen, killing and wounding the sheep, and then struck down and killed the young farmer before alluded to, and the horse on which he was riding, covering a distance of 40 yards. An investigation resulted in the discovery that the engine and boiler were of very faulty make, and that on this occasion the safety-valve failed to act.

A few days subsequent—on October the 3rd—the locomotive of a goods train which left Lewes at 9 P.M. exploded near Ashcombe. The train consisted of 45 trucks, so heavily laden that it was necessary to attach two engines, one in front and the other behind, to force it up an incline. When arrived near Ashcombe, the leading engine exploded, throwing the engine-driver and fireman to a considerable distance. The engine was shattered to fragments, and the succeeding trucks much injured. When the unfortunate fireman was picked up, he was found to be so crushed and broken that he soon died. The engine-driver was much hurt, but not mortally.

The guards of the train were both in the guard-van at the end.

21. EXPLOSION OF A STEAM-TUG.—As the steam-tug *Fury* was lying alongside an outward-bound ship in Kingroad, Bristol Channel, she exploded and was blown to pieces. The foreman and engineer, who alone could have thrown any light on the cause of the disaster, were blown overboard and perished; the mate also was blown overboard, but was picked up floating on a piece of wreck, and appeared little injured, but after being taken on shore, proved to be very dangerously hurt. This man, however, and a boy also scalded and bruised, it is believed recovered.

21. FATE OF SIR JOHN FRANKLIN AND HIS CREW.—In the volumes of the ANNUAL REGISTER for the years 1850 and 1851 a connected narrative was given of the search after Sir John Franklin up to the latter date. Since that time, the immense amount of material and labour essential to illustrate the Crimean war, the Indian mutiny, the Italian war, and other events of instant interest, have occupied these pages too fully to permit the resumption of that interesting history—which was the less necessary, that the efforts of the heroic men in that duty of love were yet unfinished. It would, however, be a great void in this CHRONICLE if it failed to record the solution of the mystery, to clear up which such heroic sacrifices had been made, and in which the world has taken so large an interest.

It may be remembered that in 1854, Dr. Rae, in the course of an overland expedition, discovered in the possession of the Esquimaux, on the west shore

of Boothia, numerous relics of the unfortunate expedition, which left no doubt of their fate; and that this inference was confirmed by the report of the natives, that in the spring of 1850, a party of about 40 white men were seen travelling southward near the north shore of King William's Land, dragging a boat; and that later in the season the bodies of 35 of these persons were found. A subsequent journey of Mr. Anderson in 1855, fixed the scene of this melancholy tale at Montreal Island, at the mouth of the Great Fish River, where he found many relics *in situ*. (See the volume for 1854, p. 180.) The parties most interested in Arctic exploration, solicited the Government to fit out an expedition to follow up these traces; but the authorities very reasonably refused, on the ground that life enough had already been endangered in the search while there was any probability left that any one of the missing crews could be recovered; but that now that it was certain that all had perished, they would not be justified in risking valuable lives in an expedition that could have no result.

Though all further assistance on the part of the nation had been thus negatived, there yet remained hearts that had not given up all hope, and hands ready to work out their wills. Lady Franklin devoted the remains of her fortune to fit out the screw steam-yacht *Fox*; Captain M'Clintock, already famed in Arctic enterprises, volunteered to risk his life in the search of his lost friend, in command of the small vessel; Lieutenants Allen Young and Hobson, and others

were found equally devoted to the cause. The *Fox* sailed from Aberdeen in the spring of 1857; wintered in the ice in the main park in Davis's Straits; and after drifting helplessly 1194 geographical miles, effected her escape in April, 1858, and proceeded on the search; and on the 21st September arrived off the Isle of Wight, with the terrible narrative of the end of the brave voyagers, and a great quantity of interesting relics. The letter in which Captain M'Clintock announced his intelligence to the Admiralty is as follows:—

“Yacht Fox, R.Y.S.

“Sir,—I beg you will inform the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty of the safe return to this country of Lady Franklin's Final Searching Expedition, which I have had the honour to conduct.

“Their lordships will rejoice to hear that our endeavours to ascertain the fate of the ‘Franklin Expedition’ have met with complete success.

“At Point Victory, upon the north-west coast of King William's Island, a record has been found, dated the 25th of April, 1848, and signed by Captains Crozier and Fitzjames. By it we were informed that Her Majesty's ships *Erebus* and *Terror* were abandoned on the 22nd of April, 1848, in the ice, 5 leagues to the N.N.W., and that the survivors,—in all amounting to 105 souls, under the command of Captain Crozier,—were proceeding to the Great Fish River. Sir John Franklin had died on the 11th of June, 1847.

“Many deeply-interesting relics of our lost countrymen have

been picked up upon the western shore of King William's Island, and others obtained from the Esquimaux, by whom we were informed that, subsequent to their abandonment, one ship was crushed and sunk by the ice, and the other forced on shore, where she has ever since been, affording them an almost inexhaustible mine of wealth.

“Being unable to penetrate beyond Bellot Strait, the *Fox* wintered in Brentford Bay, and the search—including the estuary of the Great Fish River and the discovery of 800 miles of coast line, by which we have united the explorations of the former searching expeditions to the north and west of our position with those of Sir James Ross, Dease, Simpson, and Rae to the south—has been performed by sledge journeys this spring, conducted by Lieutenant Hobson, R.N., Captain Allen Young, and myself.

“As a somewhat detailed report of our proceedings will doubtless be interesting to their lordships, it is herewith enclosed, together with a chart of our discoveries and explorations, and at the earliest opportunity I will present myself at the Admiralty to afford further information, and lay before their lordships the record found at Port Victory.

“I have the honour to be, &c.,

“F. L. M'CLINTOCK,

“Captain, R.N.

“To the Secretary of the Admiralty.”

The records found on Prince of Wales' Island, were in these words:—

“— May, 1847.

“Her Majesty's ships, *Erebus*

and *Terror*, wintered in the ice in lat. $70^{\circ} 5'$ long., $98^{\circ} 23'$ W.

"Having wintered in 1846-7 at Beechey Island, in lat. $74^{\circ} 43' 28''$ N., long. $91^{\circ} 32' 15''$ W., after ascending Wellington Channel to lat. 77° , and returning by the west side of Cornwallis Island.

"Sir JOHN FRANKLIN,

"Commanding the Expedition.

"All well.

"Whoever finds this paper is requested to forward it to the Secretary of the Admiralty, London, with a note of the time and place at which it was found; or if more convenient, to deliver it for that purpose to the British Consul at the nearest port."

[This was repeated in French, Spanish, Dutch, Danish, and German.]

"Left the ships, Monday, the 24th of May, 1847, the party consisting of two officers and six men.

"G. M. GORE, Lieutenant.

"CHAS. F. DES VŒUX, Mate."

The words "wintered in 1846-47 at Beechey Island" should be "in 1845-46," as in 1846-47 they were beset in the ice, and the ships abandoned in April, 1848. The same mistake occurs in both papers.

The relics were very numerous and of a miscellaneous character; among them were Sir John Franklin's chronometer, a sextant, a boat's medicine chest, and silver forks and spoons bearing the crest of most of the officers.

Her Majesty, in consideration of the brilliant success which had attended the expedition, has ordered that the period during which Captain M'Clintock commanded the *Fox* shall be counted to him as sea time.

27. EXPLOSION OF A PERCUSSION-CAP FACTORY. — *Twenty-one*
VOL. CL.

Lives lost.—Another and more fatal explosion of a percussion-cap manufactory occurred in Whitehall Street, Birmingham, one of the most dense districts of that busy place.

The premises, which belonged to Messrs. Phillips and Pursall, were three stories high. There were at this time in their employ, 75 or 80 persons, mostly females. About 10 A.M., several persons were engaged in the "priming shop" on the first floor, when, without any previous warning, a tremendous explosion took place, followed instantaneously by a second;—the houses in the neighbourhood were shaken, then a crash, and the building fell in, leaving nothing standing but the front wall immediately facing the public street. The timber within the walls became a mass of flame, so violent and so intense that in an incredibly short time the beams were burnt to a charred mass. Some of the unfortunate workpeople were seen attempting to find an exit, and a few who were nearest the exterior were saved. The engines arrived promptly, and by their exertions the fire in the least exposed portions were got under and the ruins searched. Sixteen or seventeen persons were found frightfully burnt or crushed and were conveyed to the hospital, and others were subsequently drawn out, similarly injured. A large concourse of persons soon assembled, many of them relatives and friends of the workpeople. As the engines cooled the ruins, these persons set to work to turn over the embers with frantic energy. They soon came upon charred corpses, many so blackened and disfigured as to be past recogni-

L

tion. By great perseverance and daring the whole of the *débris* was thoroughly searched, and in the whole 18 dead bodies were discovered, but as the whole number of persons employed in the works was not accounted for by the killed and maimed it was thought that others had perished, and two other corpses were subsequently discovered, and one of the wounded died in the hospital. An eyewitness gives the following description of this terrible scene:—

“In the meantime thousands had assembled; the engines played upon the blazing and smoking mass, as a precaution against another explosion. Very soon after that event had taken place a couple of dead bodies were pulled from the ruins. Soon after a number of men were set to work to dig over the smouldering mass of bricks and material—the contents of the pile of building. As this process went on gradually bodies were discovered; in one or two instances the poor creatures are said not to have been dead, but to have struggled convulsively yet vainly for help, which could not be given to them with sufficient haste. These must have died in extreme agony.

“As hour after hour went on the interest became painfully intense. There was no muster-roll of those who were missing, and a crowd of anxious faces stood expectantly by. The work of the diggers went on, and body after body revealed itself, a blackened mass too frightful to behold and too appalling a spectacle to describe.

“Towards the afternoon, about 3 o'clock, the excavators had made their way into the line leading from the front door of

the premises; buried three or four yards beneath the ruins of the walls and fragments they dug out the bodies of three women; it is almost needless to add that all were dead. The story of these poor creatures is soon told. They had doubtless been working on the floor, had heard the explosion above, and rushed to the door, but before reaching it were buried beneath the ruins. These three made fourteen bodies which had been dug out up to that time; but it was known then that there were others still entombed, and presently afterwards others were discovered. Those nearest the surface had been burnt to death, and a speedy work that must have been, such was the fury of the flames. Crushed beneath burning and explosive material, or stifled by suffocation, the remainder must have died as speedily. Tattered female garments were dug up, and many hundred-weight of percussion-caps from beneath the smoking pile.”

A lengthened inquiry into the cause of so fatal a catastrophe was instituted by the coroner; it was supposed to have originated in the “priming-shop;” but as all the persons employed in that dangerous department perished, no evidence could be obtained. It was stated in the course of the evidence that there were on the premises ready charged 5,500,000 caps, about 3000 or 4000 cartridges, containing about 10 lbs of gunpowder per 1000, besides a large quantity of the most explosive materials, and that firing and heat of various kinds and degrees are requisite in most of the processes. To this frightful combination of destructives is to be added the necessary quality of the article

manufactured—that of explosiveness by percussion. This was the third explosion of percussion-cap factories which had taken place in Birmingham during the year; and suggests the imperative necessity of legislative interference to prevent such dangerous trades being carried on in towns or populous neighbourhoods.

AQUATICS.—THE CHAMPIONSHIP OF THE THAMES.—The present year appears to have afforded great amusement to the amateurs of these invigorating sports.

In April the supremacy of the Thames or the Tyne was put to the trial by a race manfully rowed between White, of Bermondsey, and Chambers, of Newcastle. The northern river was the scene of the contention. Chambers won the match by five lengths.

In a contest between countrymen, one-half must be elated, and the other half mortified; all could unite in the unexampled victories of a few Englishmen over a multitude of Frenchmen on their own river. On the Seine, at Paris, there is an annual regatta, at which the picked men from all parts of France contend. At Paris also resides an Englishman, Mr. John Arthur, a devoted lover of the silver skull. This energetic amateur brought from London an English crew, to show the Frenchmen what we can do on fresh water. These champions were White, Driver, Bain, and Drewitt. Their glories are described with excusable warmth: "The sculling race came off first; an easy affair, the French having withdrawn, Driver and Bain winning the first prizes. Then followed the pair-oared race. Eight boats started. The two English pairs came in first, pulled by

Thomas White, George Drewitt, Robert Bain, and George Driver; a very good race, the Frenchmen gradually falling off astern after half the course was over. Immediately after the pair the above four were off for the four-oared race, and they had to pull against fresh crews. This race was the hardest of the day. A very plucky French crew hung on to the English four, and it was not till the race was two-thirds over that the British pluck showed its superiority, their opponents falling into the background. After these successive defeats there was some delay in bringing on the six-oared race, owing to the French crews trying to pick the six best men out of their whole numbers in order to defeat the English, who, they began to hope, by this time, were getting used up; but at last three boats got in line—the English four, to complete the number of six, were joined by Messrs. Lowe and Mr. Arthur himself. Off went the gun, away went the English, gradually increasing their distance ahead of the others, when, alas! the floating blade of an oar placed itself right across the bow of the boat, ploughing up the water awfully, and, strange to say, although bow attempted to remove it with his oar, it stuck on. The mishap soon caused the boats behind to creep up, but a tremendous spurt was put on by the English crew, who managed still to keep their boat ahead with the oar blade still clinging on, till at the turn it was knocked away, and an easy run home settled the day's sport. The people seemed quite surprised how the English had managed to keep up under such great exertion without any ap-

parent fatigue. The English crews rowed each race in new boats, built for Mr. Arthur by Wyld, of Lambeth."

At the Royal Thames National Regatta the Newcastle boat, manned by the redoubted Claspers, beat all their competitors easily.

The courses of these aquatic tournaments had hitherto been between champions not yet victors; but now Chambers, the champion of the Tyne, challenged Kelly, the champion of the Thames and the world. Kelly was, of course, obliged to accept the defiance, and the match was, of course, pulled on the London river. Kelly had won his honours by defeating Messenger, in 1857, and since that time had, unfortunately, met with no competitor. Kelly was the general favourite, but great numbers of northern amateurs came up to witness the contest, and could not be persuaded from risking large sums upon their countryman. The controversy was decided on the 29th September, on the water between Putney and Mortlake, and never were the calculations of the "knowing ones" more completely falsified, for Chambers speedily got in advance of the champion, kept the lead, and won easily by 20 lengths. The north countrymen returned home rejoicing, and "with money in both pockets."

DISASTROUS FIRES IN THE RURAL DISTRICTS.—A great number of fires have occurred in our country villages, arising, in most instances, from the careless use, in others, perhaps, from the criminal application, of lucifer matches. Buttermere, in Wiltshire, and Crowell, in Oxfordshire, have been thus laid in

ashes, while all the able-bodied inhabitants were labouring in the fields. Woodford, in Essex, was soon after ravaged—numerous cottages, homesteads, and stacks being destroyed. Willingham, in Cambridgeshire, suffered severely from at least two fires. Other fires occurred in this county, which in former days had a very evil notoriety for the numerous incendiary fires, specially directed against agricultural produce.

ENGLISH CRICKETERS IN AMERICA.—The manly game of cricket having been transplanted with the British Constitution into the American continent, the transatlantic peoples have begun to think themselves rivals of their parent in this as in all other greatness. The Canadians proffered a challenge to the best English players, and arrangements were made by which twelve of our crack batsmen were induced to pass the seas to support our supremacy. These champions were Caffyn, Carpenter, Diver, Cæsar, Grundy, Hayward, Jackson, Lockyer, Parr, Lillywhite, Stephenson, and Wisden. The first match was "Eleven of All England against Twenty-two of the Montreal Club." Above 6000 persons were present to witness the match, many of whom came from the United States. To the great mortification of the Americans—though it must in justice be said, to their admiration also—the English Eleven won easily. In their first innings the Twenty-two of Canada scored 85; in their second only 63—total, 148. The English Eleven, first innings, 117; second innings (only two out), 39. "The English Eleven play splendidly, and it is a perfect picture to see them; but they

will find their equals at Hoboken," said the *New York Herald*. At Hoboken, however, fate and skill were equally adverse to the United States players. In two hours the Eleven put all their bats out with a score of but 38; in their second innings they scored 54, making a total of 92. The Eleven scored 156 for their first innings; thus winning the match without troubling their opponents for a second course of bowling. The Eleven received other challenges, which resulted in signal victories.

DEATH OF CHARLES XII.—The following statement is given on the authority of foreign journals. "The long-voxed historical question of the manner of death of Charles XII. of Sweden, has just been settled at Stockholm. On the solicitation of Professor Fryxell, the celebrated Swedish historian, the tomb of the great warrior-king was opened on the first of September, in presence of the present king, his ministers, and several medical men, when the latter carefully examined the remains of Charles. It was found that death had been occasioned by a fragment of a cannon-ball which entered at the left side of the head and passed out on the right, a little below the ear. This clearly proved that the shot which killed the king came from the fortress of Friedrichsstein and not, as is often asserted, from his own camp; for it is a well-known fact that Charles at the moment of his death was standing in the trenches, with his *left* side turned to the enemy." Some years ago, nevertheless, a statement was in circulation, of an authorized examination of the king's corpse, in which the conclusions

arrived at differed materially from the above.

THE WEATHER.—The Summer Quarter has been of a very extraordinary character, having been on the average of the whole of 3° 3 above that of the preceding 88 years. This, however, does not represent the more extraordinary features of the case; for since between the 28th August and the 22nd September the temperature was 1½° daily below the average, the excess of the rest of the Quarter was very considerable—in fact, from July 1st to August 27th, there was an excess of 4½°, and from the 22nd September to the 31st September of 4¾°. The mean high day temperature of July was 81° 8 or 8½° above average. Only in 1779, 1818, and 1857 has the average temperature of the Quarter exceeded that of 1859. The storms by sea and land, the haloes and other phenomena which accompanied this period of excessive heat, are recorded elsewhere.

The harvest was commenced in the South of England, wheat on the 11th July, barley on the 13th, oats about the 16th; in the North, wheat at end of July, barley at beginning of August, oats about the middle of August.

The country, as represented in the Returns of the Registrar General, was eminently prosperous. 104,339 persons died during the Quarter, which, compared with the corresponding Quarter of 1858, is in considerable excess, but the mortality of 1859 is below the average. The births were 168,311, or 10,862 beyond those of the corresponding Quarter of 1858; the marriages 39,926.

This general prosperity is indicated also by the price of pro.

visions. Wheat has remained steadily for a year and nine months at the moderate average of 44s. Meat also maintains the same rate; but that great article of consumption the potato, sold at 85s. a ton, instead of 105s. and 77s. 6d., as in 1857 and 1858. Pauperism decreased with the general well-being, the number receiving relief in the Summer Quarter of 1859 being 29,000 less than in the corresponding Quarter of the two previous years.

OCTOBER.

1. EXECUTION OF RAJAH JEYLOLL SING.—Another of the great Indian butchers has paid the penalty of his crimes. Rajah Jeyloll Sing was one of the perpetrators of the massacre of Mrs. Green, Miss Jackson and above 20 other Europeans of rank at the Kaiser Bagh of Lucknow; at a time when the first frenzy of the mutiny had subsided. Unlike the other State criminals he did not submit to his fate with resigned apathy, but offered large sums of money in ransom of his life. He was hanged in front of the great gateway of the Kaiser Bagh.

The Rajah of Mittowlee, another native prince who had stained his revolt by crimes of deep dye, has been transported to the Andaman Islands for life.

— THE WESTMINSTER BELL.—“Big Ben,” the clock of the New Palace of Westminster and now supposed to be Dr. Cumming’s *The Great Tribulation come upon Earth*, struck the hours of this day and then became dumb forever. It had been discovered that this magnificent casting had become more hopelessly cracked than even its

predecessor. The discovery of the misfortune was rather singular. The preceding day (Friday) was a wild and stormy day. The wind drove the rain in clouds of sleet through the apertures of the chamber, till the moisture trickled down the sides of the great and four quarter bells in little streams. A person connected with the works happened to be in the chamber as the bells were striking the hour, and was surprised to perceive minute rows of bubbles spring from the wet bell’s side at every stroke of the hammer. It was then easy to perceive that these bubbles were thrown up by the air and water within two vertical cracks, as the metal vibrated under the strokes. When the hammer ceased to strike, and the metal lapsed into repose, these cracks became invisible, and it was only by minute inspection that they could be ascertained to exist. They were both on the side of the bell opposite to the point on which the hammer falls. They were about 2 feet apart; one is 15 inches, the other nearly 2 feet long; and extend from the sound-bow to the lip. Although the bell is rendered valueless by this misfortune, it must by no means be supposed that it had become soundless, or that its tone had become unbearable. On the contrary, the hours were still struck and the bell gave forth an ample and not unpleasant volume of sound at the blows. In fact, there was no such impression upon the auditory nerves as to force on the listeners the conviction that a great misfortune had occurred. The circumstance was reported to the authorities, who finding on investigation that

the cracks seemed to extend, directed that the striking should be discontinued.

Mr. Denison, the designer, and Messrs. Mears, the founders of the bell, Mr. Dent, the maker of the clock, and Sir Charles Barry, the architect of the clock-tower, are altogether at issue as to the cause of the mishap, and who's to blame.

It must not be supposed that any peculiar fatality attends the great Westminster bell, or that these failures show that modern founders have degenerated below their predecessors. On the contrary, it would rather appear that success in bell-founding bears but a small proportion to failure. The great bell of Moscow has never been raised from the base of its mould, and is, we believe, imperfect; and another great Russian bell cracked in the cooling. No doubt, the greater number of failures have escaped record, but of the known monsters of the air there are few that are not the successors of abortive sires. The great bell of Notre Dame was recast three times; the great bell of St. Paul's at least twice; the 7 ton bell of Montreal, cast in 1843, was soon returned cracked; the famous great Tom of Lincoln, after a long period of fame, cracked on Christmas-day, 1807.

8. DOUBLE INFANTICIDE AND SUICIDE.—Another of these terrible domestic tragedies has occurred at Worcester. In that city a man named Harris was employed as an "artist" at the Royal Porcelain Works. He brutally ill-treated his wife, by whom he had two children. At dinner on this day, during a quarrel, Harris seized his wife

by the throat and nearly throttled her. Subsequently, the poor woman made some allusions to the drunken habits of Harris's sister. The remark got round, and the sister—apparently as great a savage as her brother—came down to the house, threatening to murder her sister-in-law. A neighbour held this vixen, for the purpose of enabling the poor woman to escape from the house. She seized her children, one under each arm, and rushed forth. The Severn runs about 50 yards distant. The poor creature, demented by her many miseries, plunged in with her offspring, and all were drowned.

13. DESTRUCTION OF THE HULL THEATRE.—The Theatre Royal, Hull, was completely destroyed by a fire, which broke out about 7 A.M. The wardrobe and dresses of the company were also burnt. This theatre was erected in 1809-10, by a son of the celebrated provincial manager, Tate Wilkinson, in whose family it still remains. It was one of the finest of the provincial theatres, and the head of the "York circuit," and had some celebrity for the number of actors who made their first reputation on its boards.

14. THE GLASGOW WATERWORKS.—The citizens of Glasgow have effected for themselves a work, for a parallel to which, both as regards utility and magnitude, we must go back to the days when Rome was the mistress of the world, and with armies of slaves at her disposal, ransacked the Apennines for the pure waters of Heaven, and drew them in lofty aqueducts across the desert Campagna. Such a work is the vast system by which the superfluous waters of Loch Ka-

trine are conducted through mountain and across bog, to be distributed in countless runlets through the dwellings of Glasgow. The Act which authorized this great undertaking was passed in July, 1855, and on the 14th October, 1859, all difficulties having been overcome, the works were opened by Her Majesty with great ceremony.

The beautiful and extensive Loch Katrine, which forms a vast reservoir of the purest water, was selected as the fountain-head. The distance between the lake and the city is but 34 miles, but the intervening space is a district of extreme ruggedness; comprising mountains and bogs, rivers and glens. The lake is 360 feet above the sea. The first great engineering difficulty was to draw the water from the lake. To effect this it was necessary to perforate a mountain 600 feet below the summit, by a tunnel 2325 yards in length and 8 feet in diameter. This was the first of a series of 70 tunnels, measuring in the aggregate 13 miles, with 44 vertical shafts. The bogs were traversed by $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles of vast iron pipes; and the rivers and glens crossed by $9\frac{1}{4}$ miles of aqueducts. The system is capable of supplying to the city 50,000,000 of gallons daily. Nor is there the least fear of the supply falling short of this immense demand, for the area from which it is drawn is calculated to contain 160,000,000 cubic feet of water; without taking into account the hourly replacement by mountain streams. Proper measures have also been taken for so arranging the waters which flow into Lochs Vennacher and Drun-
kie that the river Teith shall not

fail its accustomed supplies. The cost of the immense works is between 600,000*l.* and 700,000*l.*; the total cost to the city of the whole system nearly 1,500,000*l.*

Her Majesty and the Prince Consort, and two Princesses left Edinburgh—at which city they had arrived on their journey southward—and, after making a tour round some of the most beautiful scenery of the Trosachs, crossed the foot of Loch Katrine, and reached the spot where the first outlet is constructed—about 8 miles from the lowest point. Considerable preparations had been made to give some picturesque splendour to the scene, and a large number of the magnates of this part of Scotland were present. The ceremony consisted of the presentation of an address on the part of the Waterworks Commissioners, and a suitable reply from Her Majesty. Her Majesty then put in motion the apparatus by which the waters of the lake were admitted into the tunnel, and the critical event having been notified by electric telegraph, the batteries of Edinburgh and Stirling castles, and the guns of a detachment of artillery in the Trosachs fired salutes, and all the bells in Glasgow were set ringing.

26. WRECK OF THE “ROYAL CHARTER.”—459 *Lives lost*.—Amid all the distressing accounts of shipwreck and death during the fearful gale of the night of the 25th-26th October, all losses are dwarfed beside that of the *Royal Charter*, which took place on Tuesday night in Redwharf Bay, on the coast of Anglesea. This well-known vessel was fully rigged as a sailing ship, but fitted with an auxiliary screw. She traded

between Liverpool and Australia, and on Tuesday night had just completed a prosperous voyage from Port Philip, with 498 persons, and from 500,000*l.* to 800,000*l.* worth of gold on board. She was commanded by Captain Taylor, one of the best seamen in the mercantile marine, and among her passengers was Captain Withers, an experienced merchant captain. She passed Queens-town on Monday morning, and on Tuesday evening last she passed Holyhead. The night was wild and threatening, and subsequently became most tempestuous. The ship was unhappily kept near a dangerous lee shore, in the hopes of meeting with a pilot for Liverpool. In this, however, she was disappointed, and at about 10 P.M., with a northerly gale blowing, she let go two anchors a few miles to the eastward of Point Lynas. So violent, however, was the wind and sea that the chains parted, although the engines were working at full speed in order to lessen the strain. In spite of every effort the vessel was now forced ashore, and struck the rocks stern first in 4 fathoms water. Up to this period (about 3 A.M.), not the slightest alarm was evinced among the passengers, a large portion of whom were women and children; the most perfect discipline and order prevailed. The masts and riggings were cut adrift, but caused no relief, as the ship continued to thump on the sharp-pointed rocks with fearful rapidity. Shortly after she struck, the ship was thrown broadside on, perfectly upright, upon the shelving stony beach, the head and stern lying due east and west, the former

not being more than 20 yards from a projecting rock. At this juncture one of the crew, a Portuguese, named Joseph Rogers, nobly volunteered to struggle through the heavy surf, and convey a rope on shore. Though it was not believed by any one that danger was imminent, the captain gave the order, and Rogers ably fulfilled his duty. A strong hawser was then passed and secured on shore, to this was rigged a boatswain's chair.

While this was going on a fearful scene was being enacted in the saloon. An attempt had been made by a Mr. Hodge, a clergyman, to perform a service; but the violent thumping of the vessel on the rocks, and the sea which poured into the cabin; rendered this impossible. The passengers were collected here, and Captain Taylor and Captain Withers were endeavouring to allay their fears by the assurance that there was at any rate no immediate danger, when a succession of tremendous waves struck the vessel, and absolutely broke her in half amidships. Shortly afterwards the foremost portion was again torn in half, and the ship began to break up rapidly. The mind revolts from the conception of the terrible agony of that moment, when upwards of 400 persons were struggling and choking in the waves in that confined space. It could, however, have been but one momentary pang to each—a brief convulsion, and all was over! A few of the crew saved themselves by means of the hawser; some were hurled mutilated, but living, upon the rocks by the waves; all the officers perished. Captain Taylor was the last man seen alive.

on board. He had lashed his body to a spar, and was drowned.

From the official report of Mr. Mansfield, the magistrate of Liverpool, and Captain Harris, nautical assessor, appointed by the Board of Trade to inquire into this terrible disaster, it appears that the *Royal Charter* was built at Sandy Croft, on the Dee; she was constructed entirely of iron, the plates being of more than average strength and quality; she combined the most improved principles of iron ship-building; and was fitted with auxiliary screw engines of 200 horse power (nominal), which were capable of driving her at the rate of eight knots per hour. Her masts, spars, rigging, and sails, were of approved quality, and her ground tackle appeared to be very superior; her chain cables had been properly tested, and her anchors were Trotman's patent. She had made one or two voyages, and had undergone some alterations to improve her stability and sailing qualities, which also had a tendency to make her stronger. She was in short a well-built and well-found ship.

"Upon her last voyage, the *Royal Charter*, after an unusually quick passage from Melbourne, arrived off Queenstown on the 24th of October. She proceeded up channel, and passed the Tuskar Light about 4 A.M. on the 25th. About half-past 4 or 5 P.M. she was abreast of Holyhead. Up to that time the weather had been fine, with a light breeze a-head. A change then took place, and it became hazy over the land. The vessel proceeded on her course, rounding the Skerries at 6 or half-past 6

P.M. Point Lynas Light was in sight at a quarter to 7 P.M., at a distance of 6 or 7 miles on the starboard bow. At 8 P.M. the wind was from N.E. to E.N.E., veering and blowing very hard, and had been increasing in strength from the time the ship passed Holyhead. She was heading at this time about E. by S. At a quarter to 9 Captain Taylor gave orders to starboard the helm, to which the quartermaster at the wheel replied, "The helm is a-starboard already." At a quarter to 9 orders were given to take a cast of the lead. In a quarter of an hour they first succeeded in getting soundings with the hand-lead in 18 fathoms. The screw propeller was at work, but the ship, notwithstanding, was drifting rapidly to leeward, as denoted by the lead. Shortly after this, soundings were again taken in 15 fathoms, and about half-past 10 P.M. an attempt was made to stay the ship. This appears to have failed, for shortly afterwards the port anchor was let go, and 100 fathoms of chain cable paid out. At 11.15 P.M. the starboard anchor was let go, with 70 fathoms of chain. The two anchors brought the ship up. At 1.30 A.M. of the 26th the port chain parted outside the hawse hole. Orders were then given to get up the stream anchor, which weighed only 15 cwt., and was stowed in the after orlop. The sheet anchor of 50 cwt. was stowed in the fore hatchway. It took about an hour to get up the stream anchor, and when this was done, at about 2.30 A.M., the starboard cable parted. At about 3 or 3.30 A.M. the ship took the ground; her heel seems to have struck first, and her head canted round.

to the westward, broadside on to the wind and sea. It appears that the screw stopped when the ship struck. The mainmast was then cut away; it fell a-beam, and not in the direction of the screw. The foremast was also cut away, but did not fall till the ship was washed upon the rocks, about 5 A.M., or two hours after she first struck.

"About 7.30 to 8 A.M. the vessel parted amidships, and a melancholy loss of life ensued. Such is the narrative afforded by the few survivors of the loss of the *Royal Charter*."

It would be as useless as painful to follow up the sorrowful tale of the corpses washed ashore or picked up at sea, or recovered days and weeks after from the wreck. Many of the unfortunate passengers were persons of wealth and consideration; many were successful colonists or speculators, who, having acquired wealth in Australia, were now returning to enjoy their good fortune in the land of their birth. These persons had most of them placed their gold in the charge of the captain, which, with the gold sent home as freight, raised the amount in the bullion closet to an immense sum. Many others carried on their persons, or with their luggage, considerable quantities of gold dust, or bills and letters of credit, or bank-notes. The effect of the sea upon the great iron safe in which the treasure was contained, and even upon the iron boxes into which it was subdivided, was extraordinary, and is itself sufficient to show the power of the gale. Not only was the bullion safe so totally broken up and destroyed, that it could not be discovered in

form; but the iron boxes were crushed and broken and their valuable contents dispersed, and sovereigns and lumps of gold were found forced into the very substance of the iron. The *débris* of the iron structure became the nucleus of a gold formation richer than the richest deposit of gold-bearing strata and the sands around, richer in gold-dust and bullion than the most valuable auriferous sand-bars. The insurers employed every means to recover the lost treasure, and by the exertions of divers, and bells, and other appliances, a great amount was gradually recovered. The search of these men was conducted under harrowing conditions, amid the bloated and weltering corpses of the unfortunate passengers, which the action of the waves had not yet disentangled from the twisted and battered ironwork of the wreck.

The immediate scene of the catastrophe is the village of Moelfra, situated in the hollow of a wide bay called Red Wharf Bay, which extends from Point Lynas to Puffin Island on the north coast of Anglesea. It is a shallow recess, strewn with masses of rock, partially filled in with sand. The official report notices the apparent want of preparation on the part of the captain to encounter stormy weather in the course up Channel—the ship came up Channel with her skysail masts on end and yards across. It is true that the weather was fine in the morning, and there might have been no indications of a coming hurricane, and there was no evidence to show that the barometers had been consulted. "But," say the Commissioners, "all the evi-

dence concurs in showing that the gale was terrific, and unexampled on that coast." The Commissioners add, "The officers and crew to the last were indifferent to the preservation of their own lives, and solely intent upon their duty."

The precise number of persons who perished in this dreadful catastrophe is not ascertained. When the ship sailed from Melbourne on the 26th August, she had on board 388 passengers, and a crew of 112 persons. She landed at Queenstown thirteen of the former, and two others went ashore at Holyhead; but on the other hand, while in Channel she took on board from a ship eleven riggers. This would give a total of passengers and crew at the time of the wreck of 498 persons. Of these all but 39 perished.

26. DISASTROUS GALES.—During the night of Tuesday and Wednesday, the southern and western parts of England were visited by a tempest of great severity, which on some points rose to the fury of a hurricane. The damage done on shore and at sea was very great; and the wreck of the *Royal Charter* on the island of Anglesea was a terrible disaster. From all the ports within reach of the storm came tales of shipwreck and death. The great breakwater at Portland, a work of Cyclopean massiveness, was greatly injured; the works of the harbour of refuge at Holyhead were materially damaged. At Brighton and Hastings great injury was done to the embankments; the different lines of railway that run along the shore were broken up and the traffic interrupted; and telegraph

posts were blown down everywhere. In London both property and life has been lost, though to a very small extent compared with the losses on the coast. Shortly after 5 o'clock on Wednesday morning, as a man was passing near the Surrey Canal, at Peckham, he heard a loud scream, which proceeded from a woman carried into the canal by the wind. Before he could reach her she sank. The body has not been recovered. At the residence of Mr. J. M. Pemberton, St. Andrew's Villa, Finchley Road, a large stack of chimneys and a part of the roof were carried away, and a portion of the brick-work and *débris* having fallen on the roof, broke through it into the upper bedrooms, seriously injuring some of the domestics. At Richmond a man was crushed by a falling tree; several corpses of persons drowned were found on the river shore at various places. The destruction was widely spread; chimney tops were blown down, walls prostrated, trees uprooted or broken; and the shrubs in market and pleasure gardens broken and destroyed.

The wrecks and damage to shipping was equally widely spread; but, in comparison with the loss of the *Royal Charter*, sink into nothing. Yet the aggregate loss of life, by the wreck of numerous colliers and coasting craft, was very lamentable.

Amid the gloom caused by the numerous losses above referred to, the conduct of the Channel Fleet caused a feeling of pride. The squadron, commanded by Admiral George Elliot, consisted of the *Hero*, *Trafalgar*, *Algiers*, and *Aboukir*, line-of-battle ships,

and *Mersey*, *Emerald*, and *Melpomene* frigates. The squadron was exercising between the Land's End and Plymouth, when it was caught by the gale. "The wind increased to a fury, with torrents of rain towards 11 A.M., with very thick weather, the wind heading the ships off, so that it became very doubtful if the sternmost ships could possibly get into the Sound, although it was probable the *Hero* and the headmost ships could get in. Admiral Elliot then, with the spirit of a British Admiral, decided at once (although he knew his exact position, having made the Eddystone Lighthouse) to wear the fleet together and stand off and face the gale. Although the leading ships were in good positions to wear, it was not so with those in rear of the line. The *Aboukir* had just passed the Eddystone; the *Trafalgar* and *Emerald* were still in the rear, the *Trafalgar* having been detained to pick up a man who had fallen overboard from the jib-boom, which was executed with great skill. The *Aboukir* immediately wore, set her courses, and dashed to windward of the lighthouse by carrying a press of sail, and weathered it half a mile, followed closely by the *Mersey*. The *Algiers*, *Melpomene*, and *Trafalgar* passed it very closely to leeward as the *Hand Deeps* were under their lee. What must have been the sight from the lighthouse—these leviathan ships darting about like dolphins round it in the fury of the storm, defying the elements, and the little trawlers, with their masts bending like reeds to the gale. The signal was made to get up steam to secure the safety of the ships.

The ships then got their canvas reduced and stood off the land." At 3 P.M. a singular phenomenon occurred. The gale had been blowing from the south-east, when suddenly the wind ceased, and the sun shone. Orders were given to set more sail; when with equal suddenness the ships were again caught by the gale which now blew from the north-west and with greater force than ever. It blew a perfect hurricane; and for three hours the whole fury of the tempest was poured upon the squadron. When it began, at length, to abate a little the four line-of-battle ships and one of the frigates were still in company, and all doing well. The *Mersey* and the *Emerald* had steamed into Plymouth, but the five remaining vessels kept in open order throughout that terrible night, wore in succession by night signal at about 1 A.M., made the land at daylight, formed line of battle, came grandly up Channel under sail at the rate of 11 knots an hour, steamed into Portland, and "took up their anchorage without the loss of a sail, a spar, or a rope-yarn."

27. MURDER ON THE HIGH SEAS.—At the Central Criminal Court, Charles Annois, *alias* Francisco Antonio Piero Guimaraens, aged 25, a Portuguese seaman, was indicted for the wilful murder of Philip Barker, upon the high seas, and within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty of England. The prisoner elected to be tried by a jury all Englishmen.

The vessel on board which this murder was committed was the British ship *Margaret*, which sailed from Hartlepool to a port in

North America, *via* Lisbon, at which place she arrived on the 28th July. When there, the cook was taken ill, and was obliged to go on shore to the hospital. The prisoner, Charles Annois, was engaged to act as cook and steward in his place. On the 11th of August the ship sailed from Lisbon. Matters seem to have gone on smoothly enough for some days. Although Annois was the only foreigner on board, the only dispute which occurred between him and the crew was upon one occasion when he had refused to wash up the dinner things. The captain was called upon to interfere, but he seems to have done so in a very kindly spirit towards Annois, and to have declared that although he must do his duty he should not be imposed upon by any man in the ship. This was on a Thursday; on the Sunday evening following Annois asked an apprentice on board the vessel for some gunpowder, which he said he wished to put on his little finger, which he had torn with a sack-hook. It afterwards appeared that he wanted the gunpowder for a very different purpose. He next applied to the captain for some, saying that vinegar and gunpowder would make the wound dry. Captain Barker replied that he would give him some by and by; but he did not do so. At half past 9 o'clock in the evening of Sunday the captain went into his cabin. At midnight the crime had not been committed, for at that hour the second mate reported the state of the weather to Captain Barker, and then turned into his own berth. At 4 o'clock next morning he went on deck to relieve the chief

mate's watch, and then found the prisoner on deck, and saw him go into the cook's galley. He came out from this in a few minutes, and went twice into the captain's cabin, returning each time upon deck, as though to see if the second mate was watching him. When Annois saw that the second mate was observing him, he went first to the galley, and then a third time to the captain's cabin, from which in three or four minutes' time a loud scream was heard to issue. Annois was seen immediately afterwards standing close to the door of the cabin where some of the crew were asleep, with a revolver in his hand and a knife in his mouth. The face of one of the crew was covered with blood, and the wounded man cried out, "The villain is murdering us." The second mate ran down instantly to the state cabin, and there found the poor captain with his throat cut so effectually that his head was nearly severed from his body. The chief mate had been locked in his cabin by Annois before he cut the captain's throat. The murderer now came on deck, armed with the revolver and knife. There were no other arms of any description on board, and the crew were ignorant that the revolver was unloaded. There was, therefore, much hesitation in seizing him, and the men, arming themselves with such weapons as came to hand, watched the further proceedings of the ruffian. He went into the captain's cabin and rummaged the drawers. He was searching for powder, but happily found none; for it was afterwards discovered that he had a considerable supply of caps and balls

fitting the revolver, but no cartridges. Disappointed in his quest he was secured without further resistance.

The prisoner's counsel set up in his defence the plea of insanity, and argued that the crime was of so unprovoked and atrocious a character that the prisoner must have been mad when he committed it. It was not alleged that he was mad before the murder, or that he had exhibited insanity after it—his mental alienation was confined to the brief period of his atrocious deed.

The jury having no evidence whatever before them of any insanity, found the prisoner *Guilty*, and he was sentenced to be hanged. The Portuguese minister, however, represented to the Home Secretary that there was some ground for supposing that the prisoner had been insane at some period previous to his shipping on board the *Margaret*, and he was reprieved to allow of inquiry.

28. THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.—ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT.—Under the Act, placing the Universities of Scotland upon an entirely new basis, the University of Edinburgh met to elect their first President. If literary attainments and pre-eminence in every department of philosophy and politics—eminence in everything that constitutes the glory of universities—and with those gifts unceasing devotion to the cause of education—were qualities to be sought in the President of the renovated institution—no man approached Henry Brougham—who, in addition to these gifts of nature and study, is one of the worthies of the University. Unfortunately, other influences are

powerful in the north, and some excellent but injudicious partisans nominated as candidate, the great northern magnate, the Duke of Buccleugh—a nobleman of excellent parts and unblemished character; but whose most reliable merit was that he had taken a chief part in the conduct of the Act through the House of Lords. Happily for the good fame of the University, his Grace's influence is local, the fame of Lord Brougham universal. The *alumni*, therefore, flocked in from all quarters, and the result of the voting was the election of Lord Brougham by 655 votes, to 419 for the Duke of Buccleugh.

28. FIRE AT THE LUXEMBOURG PALACE.—Between 1 and 2 o'clock A.M. the sentinels posted in the gardens, saw smoke and flames issuing from the central cupola of the Palace of the Luxembourg. This beautiful building was constructed after the design of the Pitti Palace at Florence, and after the Restoration was appropriated to the Chamber of Peers, and now under the Empire is the mansion of the Senate, which sits in the principal central hall. The Palace also contains a very fine collection of pictures and statuary, a fine library, and a collection of invaluable archives. The fire was found to be in the roof over the central hall, over which it spread with great rapidity. The ignited wood-work of the ceiling fell upon the floor below, to which it set fire, and to the seats, desks, and furniture of the apartment. About 4.20 A.M. the entire roof, with a magnificent chandelier of great weight, fell in upon the floor below, which it crushed through to the basement, injuring some of the firemen.

The destruction seems to have been confined to the Hall of the Senate; neither the galleries nor library, nor the historical departments, received any injury. The ceiling of the hall was finely painted by Abel de Pujol.

DESPERATE ENCOUNTER WITH CONVICTS.—The most exciting narratives of the buccaneers and pirates of former days can scarcely produce a parallel to the tale of the voyage of the good ship *Ararat*, from Penang to Bombay, and of what befel the captain and company during their run.

The *Ararat* is a Bombay bark of 290 tons, which seems to have been habitually employed for the transport of convicts. Captain Correya had just landed a batch of Bombay convicts at Singapore, and he was to take back a return freight of Singapore and Penang convicts to Bombay—twelve men from each place. The *Ararat* was just about to set sail upon her homeward expedition, when the Queen's steamer *Esk*, Captain Sir R. Maclure, steamed into Singapore with two piratical junks in tow, which had been caught prowling about the China Sea. There were fifty-two prisoners on board, and Captain Correya was informed that he might have the conveyance of them to Bombay as soon as the formalities of trial had been gone through, for of their guilt there was no doubt. Fifty were condemned to transportation, and handed over to the *Ararat*. It is but doing bare justice to these ruffians to add that they informed the judge that they much preferred the punishment of death to that of transportation, and, if they had an opportunity on the

voyage, they would not fail to murder everybody in the ship which had been appointed to convey them to their place of punishment. This threat was treated as the usual rhodomontade of prisoners in such cases. Little was it supposed that it would shortly receive such true and terrible fulfilment. Captain Correya, on the 19th of June, left Singapore with his fifty pirates and his twelve convicts; at Penang he took in twelve other convicts, so that his criminal freight consisted of 74 desperate men. To control these he had a guard of 15 European Madras Artillerymen and 8 Sepoys of the Marine Battalion—23 in all, besides an unarmed company, just sufficient for the working of the ship. The *Ararat* left Penang on the evening of the 25th of June, but the captain's suspicions were at once aroused by the movements of a junk which left Penang at the same time and regulated its movements by those of the convict ship. Captain Correya, not without trouble, managed to shake off such unwelcome society by the evening of the 27th. Most fortunately the 28th broke gloomily enough, and with sharp gusts of wind, so that the captain remained on deck as well as the mate. He had just lain down on the poop for a few minutes of rest when a crash was heard forward—a noise as of something giving way, and a shout. There could be no doubt that the pirates and convicts were loose. But why was no warning given by the sentry forward? The man had quitted his appointed post and had come on deck, where he had fallen asleep. The first act of the mutineers

was to stab him to the heart; and this they had accomplished so quietly and effectually that, though when he had composed himself to sleep in violation of his duty, he had taken the precaution of keeping his pistol in his hand, and his finger on the trigger, he had not even time, in the spasm of death, to contract that finger and give the alarm. As soon as the noise was heard the captain, guessing at its real meaning, rushed to his cabin for his revolver and pistols, and quick as thought was upon deck again. The mate roused the guard, and stood with grim desperation as guardian of the night-guard muskets till they should fall into proper hands. But a few seconds had elapsed from the moment of the first crash when the captain, now armed, could make out the dim figures of the pirates making their way aft. They had reached the stern of the long-boat when Captain Correya delivered his first shot. With a yell—seeing that the fight was engaged—they now endeavoured to make their way to the poop, hurling, as they came on, blocks, handspikes, holy-stones—anything, in fact, upon which they could lay their hands. By this time the guard had got possession of their weapons, and were using them with good effect.

Captain Correya and his few supporters could not, however, hope for an easy victory, for their assailants were so desperate that as soon as a musket was discharged several of them threw themselves upon it, and endeavoured to wrench it from the grip of its possessor. The fighting continued; it was pitch-dark; the flashing of the muskets af-

VOL. CI.

forded the only light which enabled the combatants for the moment to discern how the struggle was proceeding. More than once the *Ararat's* people had procured a light, but it was speedily extinguished by the pirates, who knew well that their best chance of safety consisted in not presenting themselves as marks to the fire of their opponents. It is not the least remarkable feature in this desperate scene that the captain's wife, who was on board, quietly loaded and reloaded her husband's pistols, and handed them up to him through the cuddy-light. All this time it was blowing hard, and the crew—Lascars and Spaniards without arms—had taken refuge in the rigging, and the ship was left to the mercy of wind and wave. At length the captain determined to advance; but this was to be done with the greatest caution, for, if any of the pirates could have succeeded in concealing themselves so as to get behind the guard as they advanced and obtain possession of arms, the case might have become desperate indeed. After an hour's hard fighting the pirates were at length driven to the top-gallant forecastle, and there charged with the bayonet, and killed, or driven over the bows. When lights were procured, and the loss on the side of the pirates was ascertained, out of 60 who had come on deck 28 were dead or missing. Some were wounded besides. A more desperate struggle for life has seldom been narrated. Of the crew three perished—the negligent sentry, the cook, and an Arab, who jumped overboard. When the pirates had been secured the survivors were treated to three dozen each, and

M

placed in irons. In course of the voyage, some of the prisoners contrived to slip their leg irons, and a second conflict seemed impending. Pleasant, indeed, must have been the sight of Bombay Harbour to Captain Correya and his anxious crew.

SINGULAR CASE OF CONSPIRACY.

—It is not often that so deliberately planned a scheme of extortion is to be read of as was developed before the Glasgow Court of Session these assizes. Francis Peterson, a respectable writer and factor in Glasgow, had for his tenants of a shop, one Boyle and his wife. The rent, never regularly paid, had fallen into arrear, and the Boyles devised a scheme whereby they would not only pay off their debt, but convert their landlord into a source of wealth. He was informed that if he would go to the shop at a certain day and hour he would be paid 5*l.* on account. He went, and as is very common on such occasions, was requested by Mrs. Boyle to look at a back room, where some repairs were alleged to be required. No sooner had the old man entered this room than the woman fell upon his neck, and pulled him upon the ground above her. As the victim struggled to get away from his assailant, she raised a great outcry; upon which her husband and other confederates rushed in, and, pretending to credit the woman's tale, that he had attempted to commit a criminal assault upon her, fell upon him, abused him, and tore open his clothes. They then gave him into custody. He was tried, and acquitted on manifest discrepancies of evidence. The conspirators were put on their trial

in their turn; and then an accomplice revealed the whole plot. Mrs. Boyle had come to her, and, after detailing her design, said, that if she would come in and assist in tripping him down, she should have a new gown. She refused, but said she would be a witness. Mrs. Boyle was to pull him down; Mrs. Boyle's daughter, a little girl, was to cry "Murder! my mother is being killed!" and was to go in with another to be a witness; and the husband and two other men were then to rush in. All this was accurately performed; and when the witness went in, the old man was bleeding on the left cheek, his shirt was torn open from the neck down, and his clothes were disordered. The confederation then went to a public-house, where they had some good fun over their whiskey, and Boyle laughed and said, "they had the old chap safe enough now." The imposture was even carried to the extent of sending for a doctor, and pretending that Mrs. Boyle had been much injured. It was clearly made out that the object of the conspirators was double—either to extort money from him from time to time, as hush-money, or to obtain damages from him by means of an action at law. As usual, however, in all these cases, the very precaution taken by the confederates to give a verisimilitude to their plan, afforded the means of proving its falsehood. After a trial of two days, the whole were convicted. Boyle and his wife were sentenced to penal servitude for seven years, and the two male confederates for three years each.

APPALLING SHIPWRECKS.—1200 *Coolies lost*.—Accounts from the

Eastern Seas narrate two awful wrecks, in which nearly 1200 persons perished—and perished—as is evident from the studied obscurity of the narratives—in the most horrible manner.

The *Shah Jehan* was conveying a cargo of Coolies from Calcutta to the Mauritius. On the 27th June, in lat. 12 S., long. 75 E., a fire broke out between decks. Attempts were made to extinguish or smother it; but these efforts proving unavailing, the boats were got out and provisioned, and some rafts made. The crew got into the boats, and were picked up five days afterwards by a French vessel. About 310 Coolies got on the rafts—but the account curtly says, "As these rafts had no provisions, the Coolies must have perished."

Another case occurred in October, which is more horrible if possible. The *Flora Temple*, a first-class ship, was chartered to convey Coolies from Macao to the Havannah. She sailed from the former port in October, with a crew of 50 men and 850 Coolies. There is no suggestion that these Chinamen were shipped otherwise than voluntarily; but three days after one of those inexplicable outbursts to which the Chinese seem subject took place; for they seized a favourable opportunity—rushed on the seamen, cut one to pieces, and were only reduced to submission by a plentiful use of the revolver. It was then found that the Chinese had plotted to massacre the whole crew, and take possession of the ship. When, therefore, the ship struck, and the Coolies became clamorous, the crew supposed that if the Chinese could rise upon them they would be mas-

sacred—no improbable supposition, considering the almost certain death they had brought upon their human freight. The seamen, therefore, hastened to launch and man the boats, but with such panic, that they did not stay to get provisions, much less to launch the long-boat; and it was only by the captain's firmness that these two essential points were effected. Essential—but only for the crew: the miserable Chinese had no part in their thoughts. Without attempting to form rafts, to organize any means of escape, or even to provide for prolonging the lives of the miserable men until assistance might perchance arrive—without, in short, making any effort to save a single life of the hundreds committed to their charge, they pulled off through the breakers. Themselves safe from the dangers of the wreck, and from the violence of their frenzied cargo, they laid by to witness the result. At break of day the ship appeared to be almost without motion; her masts were standing, she had a strong list to port, her back was broken, and the sea making a clear breach over her starboard quarter; the Coolies, who had remained below all night, were now up and clustered on the upper decks. The captain and crew pulled away—there follows a doleful tale of their sufferings from deficient food and the sea breaking over them—until they sighted and were picked up by the French squadron off Turon. The French admiral with great humanity sent a steam sloop to the scene of the wreck. She arrived at the reef on the 2nd November—nearly three weeks after the terrible wreck.

The sea rolled and broke as before; but no remnant could be seen of the vessel, save some woodwork still heaving to and fro in the breakers held by the chain-cable. Of the 850 Coolies no traces remained.

ROMAN BRITAIN. URICONIUM OR WROXETER.—Researches of considerable interest, as throwing light upon the condition of Britain during the Roman period, have been made on the site of the Roman city of Uriconium, the modern village of Wroxeter. The hamlet, which consists of a church, rectory-house, and a few farm-houses and cottages, stands on the eastern bank of the river Severn, about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Shrewsbury. A short distance south of the church may be observed uneven ground, rising into high mounds, overlooking the river. These hillocks are part of the walls of an ancient city. From these may be traced inland a continuous but uneven ridge, running close to the hamlet of Norton, along which it returns to the river, and runs along the brink until it reaches our starting-point. This ridge, which is somewhat more than 3 miles in circuit, covers the walls by which the place was defended. Within the space thus inclosed the ground is uneven, and abounds in fragments of ancient pottery: great quantities of Roman and other coins, and antiquities of various kinds, have been dug up; and the operations of the builder or husbandman are constantly interrupted, at a short distance below the surface, by foundations of ancient buildings, and portions of columns and sculptured stones. In the centre of the area, on the highest ground, stands conspicu-

ous a massive fragment of wall, which the most inexperienced eye immediately perceives is Roman. It is called by the inhabitants "Old Wall" or "Old Works." There is, of course, no question that this is the site of a Roman city of importance, and a reference to the *Itinerary* of Antoninus leaves no doubt that it was *Uriconium*. The city so named was certainly the most considerable place in this district, and owed its importance in a great measure to its position on Watling Street, the main line of communication between *Deva* (Chester) and *Londinium* (London), at the point where the great roads from the North of England to the south at *Glevum* (Gloucester) and from the west from *Mona* (Anglesey), to the central and eastern parts of England intersected. It is probable also that it was the head of the water-communication with the south by means of the Severn. Of the history of *Uriconium* during the period of Roman rule, or after Britain was left to its native princes, nothing whatever is known. It seems probable that its ultimate fate as a city—whatever may have been the course and incidents of its decadence—was, that it was sacked and burnt. Some antiquaries of eminence—Mr. Wright and Mr. Botfield—had long looked upon this spot as affording a favourable field for investigations, which would result in considerable information as to the civilization and manners, arts, and commerce of Roman Britain. A subscription was raised to defray the expenses, and the proper authority obtained from the Duke of Cleveland to whom the ground belongs.

The excavations were commenced by sinking a pit to the bottom of the Old Wall, which was found at the depth of 14 feet. Thence lateral trenches were dug, which struck upon the intersection of walls, which being traced proved to have enclosed a building of importance. It appeared to consist of three parallel compartments, 226 feet long. The central division, which was 30 feet wide, was paved throughout with bricks set herring-bone fashion, and appeared to have been open to the air. The side aisles were each about 14 feet wide—not paved in all parts—they appeared, in fact, to have been divided into small apartments. Several fragments of large columns and plinths of stone, and one capital of great size, which lay scattered outside, showed that this building had been architecturally enriched. Opinions are divided as to the use of this structure—whether it was a public hall or *basilica*, a market-place, or a public bath. By searching from a doorway the excavators came upon the street, which had a continuous paving of round pebbles along the centre. Adjoining the building, the workmen came upon an hypocaust which must have sustained a very fine room. Including a circular end, it was 37 feet long and 25 feet wide. The flooring had been sustained by 120 pillars in the hypocaust, 3 feet high. Continuing their works, they came upon several hypocausts of smaller dimensions. In fact, the whole of the buildings surrounding the main edifice appear to have been constructed on this system. The removal of large quantities of earth—especially

when it must be thrown out upon soil which is to be excavated in its turn—is a laborious proceeding, and very costly: as yet, therefore, no very considerable progress in uncovering *Uriconium* has been made. A generalization of the present discoveries must be sufficient. The masonry in use throughout appears to have been very massive and of excellent workmanship. The interior walls appear to have been very generally covered with mortar and painted in fresco. The outside of the buildings appears also to have been not unfrequently similarly decorated. The most novel fact revealed by the researches was the very common use of glass for windows, fragments of which were found in considerable quantity and of good quality. Coal also appears to have been used. A great quantity of articles of iron and lead—clamps, nails, rivets, pieces of chain, axe-heads, and weights have been found. Pottery has been found in considerable quantity; including some of the red or Samian ware so well known; but some of a kind almost new to antiquaries—white and of a porous texture, formed into jugs and mortaria. Among articles of personal use are numerous ladies' hair-pins, rings, bracelets, beads, fibulæ, and two combs of bone carved with considerable elegance. Of the inhabitants of this extinct city the traces were sufficient to denote that the place had perished by violence. In the great building first described no human remains were found; but on coming to the domestic buildings, bones belonging to at least three or four individuals, which apparently were

not turned up from graves, were collected. In the corner of a yard was the skull of a very young child. On clearing one of the hypocausts three skeletons were found in it. One of these was judged by the teeth to be that of an old man, the other two were thought to be females. Near the old man, lay in a little heap, 132 small copper coins; small nails and decayed wood were mingled with them—apparently the remains of a wooden coffer. Most of the coins belonged to the period of the Constantines; but some were of the period immediately preceding the Saxon invasion. In another hypocaust were found the skeletons of two other persons. The walls presented examples of the scratched drawings found at Pompeii; and there was one inscription on a plastered wall, which was mutilated before it could be copied. Considerable quantities of charred corn and wood were found, and the walls bore indications of fire. Many of the circumstances here described will remind the reader of similar discoveries in Pompeii and Herculaneum.

As the small portion of the city as yet uncovered consists chiefly of an open public building, it has yielded comparatively few relics of interest. When the principal domestic buildings shall have been reached, it is probable that valuable discoveries will be made.

NOVEMBER.

1. OTHER STORMS AND SHIPWRECKS.—The gloom caused by the great gale of the 26th October, and the disaster of the *Royal*

Charter, had hardly passed away, when the southern parts of England were afflicted by further storms of great violence, which did much damage and occasioned other fatal shipwrecks.

On Tuesday the 1st November there was a severe gale. In London some lives were lost and much damage was done. A labourer was blown off a scaffolding into the Surrey Canal and drowned. A huge sign-board torn from the top of a house fell upon a horse and cart. The animal running away overthrew a young man and severely injured him. A man and a child were greatly hurt by the fall of some ironwork from a house. Two children were blown off the pavement under the wheels of a heavy cart. A stack of chimneys fell upon a man at Westminster, a flower-pot broke the jaw of a second, and a slate the head of a third. Two men were blown into the Thames, but were rescued by a boatman. In the Pool the vessels sustained great damage. Three barges were stove in off Blackfriars Bridge; five sunk off Wandsworth; 20 small boats were smashed at Chelsea. Two young men were upset and drowned in the river.

The gale inflicted some damage on the shipping at Bristol, Plymouth, and Portsmouth, and the steamers plying to and from the Isle of Wight ceased running. Ships under orders to sail were kept in port. At Eastbourne large stacks of chimneys were blown down; one stack being carried 15 feet by the force of the wind. Trees were torn up. At Newport, in Monmouthshire, a large wooden theatre was totally destroyed by the gale.

The French brig *Olinda* was wrecked near Chichester, captain and two seamen and pilot drowned. Fourteen fishing smacks were driven ashore between Southwold and Lowestoft; a brig off Cove Hythe; a French schooner near Lowestoft; the screw steamer *Shamrock*, from Dublin, on the Holm Sand.

The gales continued, and on the 5th increased to a violent storm. Many large merchantmen put back to Plymouth dismasted or damaged in spars and sails; and many others to Portsmouth, who reported sailing through a large quantity of wreck. It is feared that a large ship, with 104 emigrants on board, had gone down at sea. Three vessels were wrecked in Bideford Bay, with, it is feared, the loss of all hands, and a brig off the Braunton Burrows. Further casualties occurred on the eastern coast. Two brigs and a schooner foundered off Yarmouth, with all hands; others came ashore about Southwold; a brig came in contact with a steamer and foundered, and five persons, her crew, perished; a brig was lost near the Texel, and her crew of nine persons also perished. On the 7th the Austrian bark *Tyrol* went on the Burbo Bank at the entrance of the Mersey. In spite of the most gallant exertions by the life-boats, the whole of the crew, and with them a Liverpool pilot, perished. Fifteen ships from Shields alone were wrecked, and the crews of six perished.

In fact, from all points of the compass came tales of loss and suffering. Not for many years have the records of maritime disaster presented so melancholy a list of casualties. During the awful gale of the 25-26th Octo-

ber, 195 vessels were wrecked on the British coasts; and it is computed that 684 persons were drowned. From the 25th to the 31st October, the number of wrecks was 248; during the gale of November 1st, 38 vessels, but happily with a disproportionate loss of life. The summary of loss from the 25th October to the 9th November, presents a total of shipwrecks, 325; of lives lost, 748. It is a pleasing reflection, however, that 487 persons were rescued by human aid—by life-boats and other means.

5. FEARFUL COALPIT ACCIDENT.

—A serious accident occurred at one of the pits belonging to Earl Granville, at Star Green, Hanley Potteries, by which ten men were killed and other ten severely injured. At half-past 2, a "cage," containing fourteen men was being drawn up the shaft of the "Big Pit," while at the same time another cage with six or seven men in it was going down. As the ascending cage drew near the surface, the signal bell in the engine-room sounded as usual in order that the engine might be at once stopped. The engine-tenter, was, however, too late in attending to his signal, and the consequence was that one cage was drawn up beyond its proper point while the other went to the bottom of the shaft with a heavy shock. The ascending cage was drawn up till it reached the wheel over which the rope attached to it worked, and was taken round it; by which the whole fourteen men, with one exception, were precipitated beneath. Six fell down the shaft and were dashed to pieces. Three fell on the pavement at the pit's mouth, and one on the iron pavement and was killed on the

spot. Four, who were thrown on the ground, received fearful injuries. The occupants of the descending cage were all more or less injured by their fall, but none of them were killed. The engine-tenter was committed to take his trial for the manslaughter occasioned by his culpable negligence.

An accident of the same nature occurred at Brunchliffe, near Leeds, on the 20th December. Four men were descending a pit, when the rope broke and the cage was precipitated to the bottom. Two were killed on the spot; the other two died in half an hour.

10. SCHILLER CENTENARY ANNIVERSARY.—The hundredth anniversary of the birth-day of the poet Schiller was celebrated in England by a large meeting of German residents in England, with a mixture of literary men and students who appreciate his remarkable genius. The occasion took the form of a "Schiller Festival" at the Crystal Palace. After an eloquent harangue by Dr. Kinkel on the genius of Schiller, a colossal bust by Gass was uncovered. The "Song of the Bell," with Raumer's fine music, formed a principal part of the concert; which also included a large number of the poet's songs. In the evening there was a torchlight procession in the grounds, after a fashion so familiar in Germany, and so unknown in this country. The anniversary was celebrated in Germany with great enthusiasm and splendour.

—EXPLOSION AND LOSS OF LIVES AT SLIGO.—A terrible accident, which caused the loss of five lives, and a great destruction of property, occurred at some mills at Ballisodare, co. Sligo.

The mills were provided with separate water-wheels and machinery for grinding flour, and the material known as "shudes," or fire seeds—the latter being a very inflammable article, usually ground only in fire-proof buildings, which these mills were. Attached to the shude mill, and communicating with it by doors on its various lofts, was a store, not of fire-proof construction, which contained large quantities of flour and shudes. It is probable that the explosion took place in the mill, which, being of immense strength, resisted the shock, and forced the expanded air into the adjoining and weaker building, where it wreaked its fury. The floors and roof of the store were blown up, and fell in shattered masses to the bottom of that building and into the adjoining yard. The mill immediately took fire; notwithstanding which the assistants intrepidly entered the ruins to rescue the workmen. Three men were drawn out mangled corpses; three others seriously injured; a fourth unfortunate was blown out of the mill on to the rocks, and was mortally injured; the confidential clerk, who was entering the buildings at the moment of the explosion, was found struck dead by a flying fragment. By the effects of the explosion, and the subsequent fire, the mill is so seriously injured as not to be worth repairs.

12. LAUNCH OF THE "VICTORIA," 121 GUNS.—A magnificent line-of-battle ship was this day added to the naval force of this country. The *Victoria* is built from the designs of Sir Baldwin Walker, K.C.B., under the immediate superintendence of Mr. Abethell, the master-builder of Portsmouth.

Dockyard; and was laid down in February, 1856. She is the first three-decked ship built according to her original designs as a steam-ship. It was announced that Her Majesty intended to be present at the launch of the noble ship, which is to bear her name. Accordingly, Her Majesty and the Prince Consort, accompanied by the Prince and Princess Frederick William of Prussia, and some of the Royal children, arrived at 11 A.M. There was assembled on the platform, beside the Royal party and *suite*, a large number of officers of the army and navy, and officials, with a large proportion of ladies; and the sheds and other places of vantage around had been judiciously fitted up to accommodate a large concourse of spectators. Her Majesty delegated to her daughter the office of "christening" or bestowing her revered name upon the noble vessel. As the shed under which the *Victoria* was built was that from which the *Marlborough* had so obstinately refused to budge, some apprehensions of a similar *contre-temps* was feared; but every arrangement was successful; the *Princess Royal* did her part with grace, the dog-shores fell, and the huge fabric glided into the water without a check. The following are her principal dimensions, horse-power of engines, and armament:—

	Feet.	In.
Length, extreme	300	0
Ditto, between perpendiculars	260	2
Ditto, keel for tonnage.....	221	0
Breadth, extreme	60	1
Ditto, for tonnage	59	3
Ditto, moulded	58	5
Depth in hold	26	10

Burden, in tons, 4126.

Her machinery will consist of two double piston-rod horizontal engines, each of 500-horse power nominal. Her armament will consist of—

Upper Deck.—1 pivot, 95 cwt., 68-pounder, 10 ft. long; and 26 42 cwt. 32-pounders, 8 ft. long.

Main Deck.—32 56 cwt. 32-pounders, 9 ft. 6 in. long.

Middle Deck.—30 65 cwt., 8 in., 9 ft. long.

Lower Deck.—32 65 cwt., 8 in., 9 ft. long.

Total number of guns, 121.

The figure-head is a three-quarter figure of Her Majesty, 15 feet in length; representing the Queen in her robes of State, the right hand holding the sceptre surmounted by the dove, and the left the orb.

12. MUTINY IN A LINE-OF-BATTLE SHIP.—Acts of general insubordination—mutiny in short—are so unwonted in the British navy, that the disturbance which occurred on board the *Princess Royal* in Portsmouth Harbour, must be looked upon rather as a civil riot than a military outbreak. The *Princess Royal*, of 91 guns, commanded by Captain Thomas Baillie, was lying at Portsmouth, after a recent cruise in the Mediterranean. At half-past 3, P.M. on that day, being Saturday, and the launch of the line-of-battle ship *Victoria* having just been successfully completed, the chief petty officers of the ship came to Commander Josling—next in authority to Captain Baillie—and requested, on behalf of the ship's company, that they might have leave ashore till Monday morning. Commander Josling replied that the captain was not on board, but that he would forward their requisition to him at the house of the Port

Admiral, and this he did accordingly, through Lieutenant Prattent. Captain Baillie was just leaving the Port Admiral's door when Lieutenant Prattent met him, and delivered his message; upon which the captain returned to the admiral, preferred the request of the men, and obtained leave, not for the whole company, but for one watch, or half of them. These orders he himself brought back to the ship, communicated them to Commander Josling, and retired to his cabin. Commander Josling consulted with the petty officers which watch should go ashore; and as they could not agree, it was proposed that they should decide by lots; but as this seemed unsatisfactory, it was finally agreed that one half of each watch should go. Presently, however, Captain Baillie received a message from the Port Admiral, requesting his re-attendance, and, as he was led to imagine, on the subject of the men's leave. As he passed along the quarter-deck he observed some petty officers in communication with the commander, and an appearance of some unusual demonstration among the men. On inquiring into the circumstance, he was told that the men were dissatisfied with the partial indulgence just obtained, and that they wanted leave for all or none. At this time the liberty-men, or the watch on leave, were already mustered on the jetty, and Captain Baillie, on observing them there as he proceeded to the Port Admiral's house, told the officer in command not to march them beyond a certain point, thinking that the admiral might be re-considering his recent assent to their departure. He then

went on to the Port Admiral, told him what had taken place, and received an order to "stop all leave." With these directions he was returning to his ship, when he found that the men had been marched beyond the point specified, and had arrived, in fact, at the very gates of the dock-yard. On reporting this circumstance also to the admiral, Captain Baillie believes—though on this point his memory is not perfectly clear—that he was ordered to march the men back again to the ship, which he did accordingly. When they were all on board again he addressed them, and said it would depend upon their behaviour whether he should ask leave for them or not on the day following; but the admonition produced little effect, for in a few minutes the disturbance commenced, and the lower deck was presently in possession of the rioters. Lights were extinguished, shots thrown about, and for some time order was completely lost in that part of the vessel. Of course, the outbreak was soon suppressed. After warning had been given to all well-disposed men to come up from below, the hatches were fastened down, marines were brought up, and the mutineers readily secured.

The most conspicuous rioters were tried by courts-martial, by which they were sentenced to various periods of imprisonment. The rest—one hundred and eight in number!—were tried in one batch, found guilty, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment, with hard labour, in Winchester Goal; to which they were actually consigned. From the circumstances which afterwards transpired, showing how much

ill-temper and mismanagement had existed at head-quarters, public sympathy was aroused, and they were discharged before the expiration of the term.

The case of a great portion of these men was certainly hard. They were all guilty of insubordination, no doubt, and the discipline of a ship-of-war must be firmly maintained, or she becomes more formidable to her friends than to the enemy. When the men left on board, in pursuance of an arrangement to which they were themselves parties, became troublesome, it was natural and proper that they should be checked, and if necessary punished. *These* men attempted to gain by violence and insubordination a license which had been refused to them by competent authority. But the poor fellows to whom the license had been given by the same authority, and who were now at the dock-yard gates in high glee at their anticipated holiday, had done nothing to justify their being marched back. They were not extortioners of a refused boon, for they had it; nor of the grumblers, for they were not on board ship. It was not, therefore, at all unnatural that on being called back, without offending, from enjoyment just within their grasp, they should be discontented and riotous.

15. REMARKABLE LUNAR PHENOMENON.—Mr. Lowe, the astronomer, says,—“I have never observed a more remarkable appearance than the one which occurred last night, and which was visible at the Beeston Observatory, from 10.58 P.M. till 11.25 P.M. It consisted of a beautiful lunar corona, 10° in width, which exhibited faintly

the prismatic colours. Also an ordinary bright halo, or circle of $22^{\circ} 30'$ radius, having the moon for its centre; and a second very perfect circle, far too gigantic to allow of its being all seen at once, and therefore in the N.W. giving the appearance of an inverted rainbow. This circle had its centre 17° N.W. of the zenith, while its southern edge passed through the moon. It was exactly 90° in diameter, yet gave the impression of being much larger. There were also seven mock moons. Two were situated at the intersections of the two circles, two others on the moon's horizontal level, and just without the circle of $22\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ radius, the fifth and sixth on the great circle, at a distance of 50° from the moon on either side, and the seventh on the same circle, a short distance without the smaller circle on the N. side. A lunar halo, and a small portion of the great circle, were seen for a short time by my assistant at 7 o'clock. This phenomenon was formed in cirri, and owed its disappearance to these clouds becoming cirrocumuli. At 10.10 A.M. a solar halo, and a faint repetition of the great circle of last night crossing the sun, was visible for a few minutes.”

Mr. Lowe also calls attention to the numerous solar and lunar haloes and mock images of these luminaries seen of late.

16. SALE OF MAJOLICA.—A collection of Majolica and other ware, the property of M. Montferrand, has been sold, some of the specimens of which brought such large prices as to be worthy of note. A dish, with sunk centre, with “Story of Niobe,” 35*l.*; pair of oviform vases, representing the “Annunciation and Salutation,”

50 *gs.*; oval Palissy ware dish, 50 *gs.*; pierced tazza of Palissy ware, 40 *gs.*; a very fine tazza, signed by Maestro Giorgio, 180*l.*; pair of Pesaro dishes, 89 *gs.*; a dish, subject, the "Descent from the Cross," after Albert Durer, 45 *gs.*; pair of oviform vases, subjects, the "Judgment of Paris," "Venus and Cupid, Justice," and other ornaments, 116 *gs.*; circular group, "The Virgin and Child and St. John," modelled by Luca della Robbia, 100*l.* The collection produced upwards of 2000*l.*

19. POISONINGS BY MISTAKE.—The carelessness of a chemist at Canterbury has caused much anxiety in that city. A young man named Cole being unwell, his wife purchased a black draught and blue pill at the shop of Mr. Reeve. The pill was administered in due form at night, the draught in the morning. About an hour after taking the draught he became unable to walk, was got into bed, became drowsy, and in three hours died. He was buried; but the suddenness of his death occasioning talk, his corpse was exhumed and examined; and was found to contain laudanum in considerable quantity. In fact, in making up the medicine, the shopman had taken up a bottle from which the label had dropped, and which contained laudanum, and used it for a constituent of the black draught, in proportion at least one-third of the whole.

The chemist was committed on a charge of manslaughter.

It is well known that the formula of "blue pill and black draught" is highly popular and in great request; it is frequently made in considerable quantities; and this fatal phial appears to

have contained only its proportion of a large decoction. Consequently the alarm spread far and wide. Many persons had taken a "blue pill and black draught," purchased at Mr. Reeve's shop; many had been violently affected after it, and some were said to have died. The corpse of another person was disinterred and an inquest held; but the circumstances clearly pointed to a natural death. It does not appear that death was in any other case reasonably traced to the carelessness of Mr. Reeve or his shopman.

21. WRECK OF THE "INDIAN" MAIL-STEAMER.—The loss of the *Argo* on the coast of Newfoundland has already been recorded: another fine mail-steamer has been lost in the same parts. The *Indian*, one of the fleet of the Montreal Steamship Company, sailed from Liverpool on the 9th of November, for Portland, in the State of Maine. She had 38 passengers and a crew of 79 men. On the 19th she made Cape Race, the south-eastern point of Newfoundland, where her position was accurately ascertained. Her course now lay over certain well-known banks between Cape Race and Nova Scotia. The captain appears to have become doubtful of his exact position, and repeatedly brought the ship to, and took soundings; which appeared to indicate that he had passed over all the most dangerous points, and especially that he was past Sable Island. The ship's course was altered accordingly, when she struck upon the Seal Rocks, on the coast of Nova Scotia. A flashing light had, it appeared, been erected near the spot since

the captain's chart was printed and which was unknown to him; but it seems quite uncertain whether he was misled by this light or by the light of some passing ship. The sea was quite calm, but there was a very strong current which sent heavy waves against the ship's side. What then occurred is not very clearly explained. One boat was struck by a heavy roller, while she was hanging to the davits ready for lowering, which capsized her and washed out all the persons in her. The other boats were safely lowered, but were drifted out to sea with their crews, apparently without receiving the passengers who were to embark in them. Other boats were there which appeared to have done little or nothing. The number of persons drowned appeared to be 27. One of the officers in a boat reached the shore, and with much exertion procured a schooner, which took off from the wreck all the survivors, who endured great hardships on that inclement coast. The conduct of the inhabitants along the shore towards these unfortunate persons is described as being most inhuman. Their chief object appears to have been to plunder the wreck. In this shameful quest their greediness seems to have met a part of its reward, as a schooner pressing in too eagerly for the spoil was destroyed on the rocks. The official inquiry declares the conduct of the captain to be free from blame.

23. UNLUCKY THEFT.—Three of those ragged little urchins who spend their time in antics about Covent Garden Market, and pick up any unconsidered trifles that come within reach, were placed before the Bow Street magistrate

charged with having stolen about 12 oz. of a poisonous drug called belladonna, and administering it to other boys, whereby their lives were endangered.

It appeared that a herbalist in the market packed in a hamper two jars containing belladonna made into a salve, and left it outside his shop to be at hand for the carrier who was to call for it. The package attracted the attention of the young prowlers, who took an opportunity of cutting open the brown paper cover and helped themselves to about 12 oz. of the luscious prize, which on inspection and tasting they took for Spanish liquorice. One of them, seized with envy at the success of the operating thief, exclaimed, "You shall not have it all," and snatched away a portion of the booty, which he immediately swallowed; and in consequence became delirious and had a narrow escape from death. The plunderers now converted the compound into that popular beverage, liquorice water, by aid of the pump at hand: and dispensed the deadly draught to all applicants at the easy rate of a pin a drink. Their customers, of course, suffered in proportion to their greediness or their "realized property" in pins; but though some were seriously ill, fortunately none died.

27. MURDER AND SUICIDE IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE.—A sad tragedy has occurred at North Nibley, in Gloucestershire. A young fellow named John Sheppard, who seems to have been a worthless character, had "kept company"—or rather had forced his company upon a well-conducted young woman, named Ann Smitham, for four years. The

young woman had repeatedly rejected his suit, and her poor old mother said, "I have myself, times out of number, told him she should not think anything of him, for she would have no prospect but the Union before her, and she would never give up her home for such a character as him." "On Saturday evening"—to take the tale from the mouth of her father—"she was standing in my kitchen, close to a round table near the window, sewing. There was a lighted candle on the table in front of her, and between her and the window. I was at work at my loom in the shop adjoining the kitchen, the door of which was open. I saw her take the candle off the table and go to the window, where there was a white curtain drawn the whole length of the window. There is a window in the shop, which had no curtain to it, and any person looking through the window could have seen the deceased standing at the table. I saw my daughter move aside in the farthest corner on the left hand side, and heard her say, 'Thou beest there, bee'sn't? I have caught thee.' I heard her mother say, 'Is that Sheppard?' and she said, 'Ay, 'tis.' I said, 'It doesn't seem to matter what weather it is, rain or wind, or what not, he's about.' She said, 'Not a bit;' and letting the curtain fall back again, returned to her work, and put the candle on the table. She was standing in rather a leaning position over the table, sewing, with her face towards the kitchen window. I then heard the report of a gun outside and close to the kitchen window, about three or four minutes after she had returned

from the window. She screamed out, and I got up instantly from my loom and went towards her. Her mother came up first, and she was in the act of falling when I approached. She never spoke. I observed blood coming from her mouth."

The poor girl died in 10 minutes.

In the meanwhile the murderer had fled, nor could the exertions of the police find any trace of him until the following morning, when a constable found him in an orchard, lying on his back, about 15 yards from a shed. "The left cheek of his face appeared to have been blown clean away. He was bleeding a little, and there was a quantity of congealed blood around the wound. His clothes were saturated with blood. I spoke to him; but he made no reply, as he did not appear to be sensible. There was a quantity of straw in the shed and a pool of blood in it, and there was much blood in different places in the shed and upon the doorposts. Outside there were marks on the door of a person's knee having been against it. Directly underneath the straw I found the single-barrel gun produced, smeared with blood, and indicating that it had been recently discharged. I removed Sheppard upon a hurdle to the White Hart Inn. In his trousers pocket was a canvas bag containing some shot of the same size as that found under the deceased and taken from her. He was kept warm, and had medical assistance. He became sensible, asking several times for toast and water. He made no allusion whatever to Ann Smitham."

While the coroner's jury were

LAW CASES.

I.—CIVIL CAUSES.

II.—CRIMINAL TRIALS.

I. CIVIL CAUSES.

THE SHREWSBURY ESTATES.

*(In the Common Pleas—Thursday,
June 9, 1859.)*

THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY *v.*
HOPE SCOTT AND OTHERS.

OUR readers will recollect that in the Volume of last year was given an abstract of the proceedings before the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords, on the claim of Earl Talbot to the earldom of Shrewsbury. His lordship then succeeded in proving not only that he was a descendant in uninterrupted male line from the first Earl of Shrewsbury, the "valiant John Talbot" of Henry VI., but that he was the nearest descendant in male descent from that hero, and was, therefore, as heir in tail male, entitled to the earldom according to the limitation of the patent of creation. The result was that the Lords affirmed that Earl Talbot had made out his claim, and his lordship has since sat in the House of Peers as Earl of Shrews-

bury and Earl Talbot. The decision of the Lords in respect of the earldom did not affect the further claim which his lordship made to the very large estates which had heretofore descended with the title, and which rested upon an entirely different footing, and could be established only by another chain of proofs, and before another tribunal. The Earl claimed these ancient possessions as annexed to the title by a private settlement made in the year 1700 by the then Duke and Earl of Shrewsbury, confirmed by another settlement made in 1718, and embodied in an Act of Parliament. By these deeds the estates then possessed by the Earl of Shrewsbury had been so settled as to descend to the persons who should succeed to the earldom, and were, in popular language, annexed to the title under circumstances and with limitations which are the subjects of discussion in the cause now narrated.

Bertram Arthur, the last Earl of Shrewsbury of the Roman Catholic line, conceiving himself to be relieved from the disabilities

imposed by the conditions and limitations contained in the deeds before referred to, went through the legal form of "suffering a recovery," executed a disentailing deed, and by his will devised his estates to trustees in trust for various persons, but chiefly for a younger son of the Duke of Norfolk. The Earl of Shrewsbury and Talbot sought to recover the estates from the trustees by an action of ejectment in the Court of Common Pleas, asserting the subsistence and continuing validity of the restraints on alienation imposed by the Parliamentary Settlement, and denying the validity of the act of the deceased Earl.

Since the proceedings on the claim to the earldom had established that Earl Talbot was the heir in tail male of the first Earl, and, therefore, now Earl of Shrewsbury, the controversy was reduced to the legal question of the validity and effect of the several deeds and settlements referred to. A formal verdict was, therefore, taken for the plaintiff, with leave reserved to the defendants to move the Court to enter the verdict for them if it should so appear to the Court after cause shown. It will readily be supposed that a cause in which such vast interests were at stake, and the parties to which had all the power which wealth can give, did not lack the ability of the most able counsel, and that these learned gentlemen did not spare either acuteness or perseverance in advocating the great interests entrusted to them. The arguments were continued on many days, and after frequent intervals. When all had been said that could possibly be advanced, and

at the conclusion of the reply of the Attorney-General for the trustees, the Court delivered its judgment.

The LORD CHIEF-JUSTICE COCKBURN said:—This case has occupied the Court so long a time, and has had so much light thrown upon it by the elaborate arguments of which the Court has had the assistance, and we have had such full and abundant opportunity and materials for the consideration of the great questions involved in it, that we have been enabled to come to a clear and decided opinion, and think, therefore, that we ought not, merely on account of the magnitude of the interests involved, to delay pronouncing our judgment, or appear, by any apparent hesitation, to give countenance to the supposition that any doubt exists in our minds, when, in point of fact, none whatever does exist. We feel, therefore, that we ought at once to pronounce our judgment.

The great question in the case is, whether Bertram Arthur, the late Earl of Shrewsbury, being tenant in tail in possession of the estates in question, was competent, by executing a disentailing deed, to put himself in the position of being able to aliene these estates as he might think proper and advisable. This question will depend ultimately upon the construction to be put upon the provisions of the Shrewsbury Estate Act of the 6th George I. chap. 29. The plaintiff contends that, by force of that Act, aided by the repeal of the qualifying provision of the 8th section by the more recent Estate Act of the 6th and 7th Victoria, inalienability was, by legislative enactment, annexed to the estate tail. The

defendants join issue upon that question with the plaintiff. But before they come to this great battle-ground, the defendants take two positions, their success in either of which would preclude altogether the necessity of entering into the consideration of the effect of the statute of the 6th George I. It becomes, therefore, necessary to deal with this part of the controversy in the outset.

In the first place, the defendants affirm that Earl Bertram Arthur was seised of these estates under and by virtue of the prior settlement of the Duke of Shrewsbury of the year 1700, which they allege to have been a co-existing and co-ordinate settlement; and they contend that, although it may be true that so long as they were under the necessity of resorting, in the then state of the law, to the posterior settlement of 1718 and the Act of Parliament which confirmed it—which I will call “the Parliamentary Settlement”—for protection and immunity from the existing law, they were not in a condition to alienate; yet, when by the alteration of the law affecting Roman Catholics it was no longer necessary to seek protection under that Parliamentary Settlement, then, as the other remained in independent and unimpaired force and vigour, and as the late earl was tenant in tail under it without any incapacity as to alienation attaching to him, it was competent to him to bar the entail and dispose of the estate. This position is met by an antagonistic one on the part of the plaintiff, that the settlement of 1700 was entirely abrogated, superseded, and set aside by the posterior Parliamentary Settlement. And

if this contention of the plaintiff is right, no doubt it follows as a matter of course that, if the effect of the 6th of George I. was to prevent alienation, unless that provision has been done away with by any subsequent alteration of the law, the late earl was not competent to alienate. It becomes, therefore, a preliminary question of very great importance how far the settlement of 1700 continued in force.

On the part of the defendants we are told with truth that there is not in the 6th George I., chap. 29, any express repeal or annulling of the settlement of 1700. It is observed, and truly, that in the settlement of 1718, Earl Gilbert, who had succeeded the duke in the dignity of the earldom of Shrewsbury, declares his desire to confirm the settlement of 1700; and further, that in the Act of the 6th George I. the settlement of 1700 is again referred to as one of the provisions of which it was the intention of Gilbert Earl of Shrewsbury to carry into effect. And we are further told, with truth, that in the subsequent Shrewsbury Estate Acts, the settlement of 1700 is referred to as a still subsisting settlement. On the other hand, it is pointed out to us that the provisions of the two settlements are irreconcilably at variance; and that it cannot, therefore, be conceived that those who were parties to the later settlement could have intended that the first should continue to be in force. And it is observed, with equal truth, that in the later Shrewsbury Estate Acts, the prevailing power of the Parliamentary Settlement is assumed; and that power is taken by these Acts to alienate portions of the estates

on the assumption that the restraint on alienation contained in the 6th George I. was still subsisting and operative, and binding on the tenant in tail. Various instances of discrepancy between the two settlements were brought to our attention by the counsel for the plaintiff. I pass over the minor points of difference, and direct my attention particularly to those which are immediately material and important to the present inquiry; and I find two so remarkable and important, that upon them I found my opinion that it is quite impossible that the first of these two settlements can, at least in its integrity, be considered as subsisting. The first point of difference is the very important one that there is introduced between the estate tail and the estate in reversion a new limitation to a new set of tenants in tail. Now suppose for a moment that that which might have happened within a very few years from the date of the later settlement had in point of fact then taken place, instead of having happened, as it has done, after an interval of a century and a half; suppose that the intermediate estates had been determined by failure of issue—that George and John, the tenants for life, had died, having had no issue, or that their issue had died—and that then the heirs of the body of the first Earl of Shrewsbury, who had been introduced between the former tenants in tail and the reversionary estate in fee, had claimed, under the later settlement, possession of the estates; while, on the other hand, the heirs of the Duke of Shrewsbury, who were entitled to the reversion under the settlement of 1700,

had come forward to assert their claim, on the ground that the settlement of 1700 was still a subsisting settlement—you would here have had conflicting claims which could not by any possibility have been reconciled. But there is, as regards the present inquiry, a still more striking discrepancy between the two settlements. I assume, for the purpose of this part of the inquiry, that the effect of the Parliamentary Settlement is to render the estate inalienable by the tenant in tail. I assume this, at present, only for the purpose of this part of the inquiry; it is a matter which I shall have to consider hereafter; but assuming that this new condition was introduced by the Parliamentary Settlement, the two settlements become wholly inconsistent and irreconcilable. By the first, the tenant in tail would have had, as every tenant in tail has by law incidental to his estate, the power of barring the entail by suffering a recovery, and so disposing of the estate; whereas by the new settlement he was deprived of this most important right.

What, then, is the conclusion to be arrived at? I do not think it necessary to adopt either of the two antagonistic propositions of the plaintiff and defendants to the full extent to which those propositions have been sought to be carried: it is enough for the present purpose to say, that, even assuming the settlement of 1700 to have been left as a subsisting settlement, so far as its provisions were reconcilable with those of the later settlement, it is impossible, looking at these manifest and striking inconsistencies, or, I should rather say, irrecon-

cilable contradictions, not at least to go the length of saying—that if the two settlements are to be considered as co-existing and co-ordinate, the later one, where it alters or qualifies the first, must be considered as the dominant settlement—as overriding the earlier one, and making it subordinate to the terms of the second. An analogy to this will be found in the well-known common case where an act of Parliament, though not expressly repealed by a subsequent act, is, by being brought into contradiction with it, virtually repealed either in the whole or in part. We all know that where a later act of Parliament contains provisions inconsistent with those of a former act, the effect is a virtual repeal so far as the inconsistency goes. So here, if these two settlements cannot be reconciled with one another, then, assuming them to have a concurrent existence, the later must prevail over the earlier where their provisions are inconsistent. This is quite enough for the present purpose: because if here the later settlement has imposed the condition of inalienability upon the estate of the tenant in tail, even granting that the settlement of 1700 is still in existence, it must be taken to be in existence subject to the conditions which the later settlement has introduced. And I have the less hesitation in adopting this view, because it seems to me to be perfectly consistent with what I find to have been the course pursued in the later legislation with regard to these same estates; and as the successive possessors of this title and these estates no doubt had recourse to, and had the advantage of

VOL. CI.

the best legal assistance that the profession afforded—when we find that in all the subsequent legislation two things have been assumed, a concurrent existence of both the settlements, but, also, the dominant power of the later one over the earlier—so that although the settlement of 1700 might be in existence, and it might be necessary to refer to it in the subsequent Estate Acts, yet it was always assumed that the later settlement imposed the condition of inalienability on the estates—and when we find that the Legislature has upon all occasions adopted this view in the Estate Acts which have since been passed, I think all this goes a very long way to confirm the view I am now taking and propose to act upon, namely, that, without deciding whether the one settlement superseded and abrogated the other (though I am bound to say that if it were necessary to decide that question, the inconsistency between the two appears to be so irreconcilable that I should be prepared to go the length of saying that the latter did supersede and abrogate the former), yet, assuming, with the counsel for the defendants, that the settlement of 1700 is still subsisting, it must be taken to be controlled and limited by the subsequent settlement, and therefore if, according to the latter, these estates cannot be alienated, it follows that this provision operates upon the settlement of 1700, and renders alienation under it impossible. This disposes of the first point made by the defendants, and brings us to the second.

The second ground the defendants take is that, assuming that

Y

the Parliamentary Settlement would, if valid, have the effect of rendering the tenant in tail incompetent to disentail the estate and aliene it, yet the settlement of 1700 is not affected by the Parliamentary Settlement, because the latter was altogether invalid. And this is put on two grounds; and I think the best form in which I can put the argument for the defendants is to put it in the shape of this alternative proposition. The estates created by the Parliamentary Settlement must be taken either to have been carved out of the reversionary estate in fee, or to have been created at the expense of the estates tail, or to have been formed out of both. If they were carved out of the reversionary estate in fee, then, say the counsel for the defendants, the Parliamentary Settlement fails, because the reversion being to the right heir of the duke, and Earl Gilbert being such right heir, Earl Gilbert was incapacitated by the then existing state of the law from taking any such reversionary estate, and, therefore, he being the granting party, and the act having been obtained at his instance, he could not grant or be a party to the granting of that which was not in him. And if, on the other hand, the estate was either created at the expense of the estate tail, or was created out of the estate tail and the reversionary estate in fee, then, as the tenant in tail was an infant, and was not a party to this act, and the act was a private estate act, it would be inoperative to affect his rights, and consequently as against him was of no effect. This I understand to be the alternative proposition contended for on the part of the de-

fendants. The first point depends upon the question of fact whether Earl Gilbert, in whom the reversion in fee would otherwise have been at the time of the Parliamentary Settlement, was a Jesuit priest, and had resorted to an establishment or college of Jesuits abroad, for the purpose of being instructed in the Roman Catholic religion and becoming a Jesuit, so as to be within the disabling statute of the 1st James I., c. 4. I shall assume, for the purpose of the observations which I am about to make, that Earl Gilbert was at the time of the settlement of 1718, and of the Act of Parliament of the 6th George I. c. 29, within the incapacitating provisions of the statute of the 1st of James I., c. 4.

Assuming this, the first question which arises is, whether that statute would have the effect of incapacitating Earl Gilbert from taking a reversion in fee, so as to be a party to carving a further estate out of it. Then comes a question of a different nature, but not of less importance; namely, whether the estate with which we are now dealing was in point of fact carved out of the residuary estate in fee of Earl Gilbert.

As regards the first branch of the question, I am of opinion that the effect of the statute was not to incapacitate Earl Gilbert from being a party to this settlement and the Act of Parliament which establishes it.

As regards the second branch of the question, although it is true, as was observed by my Lord St. Leonards in the House of Lords, that, as regards the estate in remainder introduced for the first time by the Parliamentary settlement in favour of the heirs

male of the body of the first Lord Shrewsbury, an estate was created at the expense of the reversionary estate in fee, and that estate was in fact carved out of the estate of Earl Gilbert who was the reversioner in fee; yet, as regards the estate with which we have now immediately to deal, it appears to me plain that the estate was not one taken out of the reversion, but one created at the expense of, or, at all events, substituted for, the estate tail created by the settlement of 1700. The settlement of 1700 gave an estate tail to the eldest son of George. So does this Parliamentary Settlement; but with this difference, that, whereas the settlement of 1700 gave an estate tail with the ordinary incident of such a tenancy, the capacity to alienate upon suffering a recovery, the Parliamentary Settlement either created a new estate tail, taking from it that incident, or, if the settlement of 1700 was kept alive and the two are to be taken together, it took away that incident of the former estate tail, and annexed to that estate the condition of its being for the future inalienable. It appears to me, therefore, a fallacy to say that the estate which we are now dealing with, namely, the estate tail, in the heirs male of the body of George, and afterwards in those of John, created by the Parliamentary Settlement, was an estate carved out of the reversionary estate in fee of Earl Gilbert. But it is the prior estate tail, not the estate tail in remainder carved out of the reversionary estate, of which Earl Bertram Arthur has taken upon himself to dispose.

But even if the defendants' contention were right, and this estate

was an estate taken out of the reversion of Earl Gilbert, and even if Earl Gilbert was incapacitated by the effect of the statute of James I., as contended for on the part of the defendants, I should still say that that would not avail the defendants as a ground why this Act of Parliament should be held to be inoperative; and for this reason:—wherever the reversionary estate was (and it must have been somewhere), Parliament took upon itself to deal with it, and in the plenitude of its legislative power disposed of it; and if Parliament thought fit to deal with this estate as the estate of a man who was capable of disposing of it, it is not for a court of law to entertain the question whether or not, if the reversionary estate had come into possession, some one might have asserted a right against the party in whom the reversionary estate was assumed by Parliament to be, on the ground of his incapacity to take.

And it should be observed that this objection is not taken by any one whose rights have been affected by Parliament treating the reversionary estate as in Earl Gilbert, and disposing of it. It is no representative of Earl Gilbert who upon the present occasion asserts a right; it is no representative of the Duke of Shrewsbury who now holds these estates against the plaintiff, but persons deriving title from the tenants in tail, whose estate was anterior to the reversionary estate, and whose rights, except so far as they are established by the Act, are expressly excepted from the saving clause.

This brings me to the other head of objection. It is said that,

Y 2

assuming that these were estates taken from the estate of the tenant in tail, the tenant in tail was not a party to the act. Now, in one sense, he certainly was not a party to the act; for, far from being a concurring party to it, he opposed it by his *prochain ami*. His uncle, Lord Fitzwilliam, appeared as his next friend, before the committee of the Lords. Objections were taken on his behalf to the proposed Parliamentary Settlement, upon the ground that he was tenant in tail under the settlement of 1700, and that, as such tenant in tail, he would have a right to bar the entail and aliene the estate, and that this right was about to be taken away from him by the Bill. On the other hand, not only was the whole question gone into before the committee, and the rights of the infant fully understood there, but the matter had previously been referred to two Judges who, according to the practice which then prevailed in these matters, took all the evidence, had the settlement before them, and were made perfectly acquainted with the infant's rights. They reported upon the Bill to the Lords, before whose committee the whole matter was again gone into and the evidence taken anew; so that the committee were in full possession of all the facts—of the existence of the infant heir, of the rights which he had under the settlement of 1700, and of the manner and extent to which those rights were about to be affected by this Bill. After which, Parliament, with a full knowledge of all the circumstances, deliberately and advisedly passed an Act which contained a provision that the rights of that infant as to alienation should be

for ever extinguished except upon a certain condition. Nay more, it introduced this latter condition for the special protection of his rights, so far as it thought fit to preserve them; and having thus established and limited his rights as it thought fit in its discretion, it specially excluded him from the operation of the saving clause. It seems to me, therefore, that as on this occasion the infant tenant in tail was represented before Parliament, and the true state of the settlement and the rights of the parties taking interests and estates under it were brought to the attention and knowledge of the committee and of the legislature, and then the estate of the infant tenant in tail taken under the former settlement was dealt with by this Act, and the rights of the infant excepted from the saving clause, he and those who came after him as his representatives must be bound by the Act.

This, then, brings us to that which is, in fact, the great question between these parties,—namely, the effect of what I have termed the Parliamentary Settlement. The question is, whether by the Act of Parliament the tenant in tail is prevented from disentailing the estate and alienating it as the late Earl has done. Now, if we had simply to deal with the clause of the Act of Parliament upon which this question arises (the 8th section of the 6th of George I., c. 29), the matter would be much more free from difficulty than it perhaps now is. But we are told that we must not construe and give effect to the clause by reference solely to its terms. We are asked to interpret and give effect to it;

looking at it not merely as an enactment specially intended to affect these estates alone, but as a provision of the general public law affecting the rights or disabilities of Catholics, introduced into this private Act of Parliament to keep it in harmony with the general law. It is said that, whereas the persons who were to take estates under the settlement were Catholics, and therefore, by the law of the land as it then stood, incapacitated from taking these estates, and the 2nd section had been introduced to relieve them from that disability and to give them an exemption from the then state of the law, the 8th section was added for the purpose of preventing the boon and privilege thus conceded from operating to the extent of enabling them to alienate the estate contrary to the existing law, by which the power of alienation was taken from Roman Catholics. The importance of this contention of the defendants is this: they say, that, this having been the reason why this clause was introduced into this Act of Parliament, so soon as, by the alteration of the general law of the land, the disabilities of the Catholics were removed, the clause fell to the ground by the effect of the general legislation, and the tenant in tail held the estate relieved from the clog or incumbrance which had before been imposed upon it.

Now this argument would be a very much more cogent one if it were the fact that by the then existing laws relating to Roman Catholics, the power of alienating their estates had been taken away. But upon carefully looking into the Acts of Parliament at that time affecting the rights of Catho-

lics with reference to property, I cannot find that there was anything that either directly or indirectly prohibited them from alienating their estates. And it would have been strange if it had been so; for, the very policy and object of the law being to prevent the real property of the country accumulating in the hands of the Catholics, whereby they might obtain power and influence, it would have been contrary to that policy to enact that if an estate once got into a Catholic, he should not be capable to pass it away and get rid of it. I am not surprised, therefore, that when one turns to the statutes, one finds in them nothing in the shape of a prohibition against alienation. Difficulty, no doubt, sometimes arose as to alienation; but it arose entirely from the law saying that a Catholic should not acquire real property—that he should not inherit, take, hold, or enjoy it: from this inability to take, it came in some instances to be contended that there was an inability to convey and transfer.

It will be expedient to pass briefly in review the statutes which imposed incapacity. (His lordship then referred to 1 Jac. I., chap. 4, sec. 6; 3 Jac. I., chap. 5, sec. 16; 3 Car. II., chap. 2; and 11 and 12 William III., chap. 4.)

Now, in none of these statutes is there any prohibition against alienation. Difficulty arose only when a Catholic, disabled by any of these statutes from taking, but who had, nevertheless, in fact, taken and acquired possession, proceeded to aliene. The question is one of considerable nicety, but the effect of the authorities seems to be, that, though

incapacitated from taking for the purpose of personal enjoyment, the Catholic was not incapacitated from taking for the purpose of disposing of the estate. The matter early became the subject of legal consideration. His lordship then proceeded to analyze the leading cases on this point: as *Tredway's Case*, *Hobart*, 73; *Thornby v. Fleetwood*; *Matlem v. Bingloe*, 2 *Comyns*, 570; *O'Fallon v. Dillon*, 2 *Schoales & Lefroy*, 18; *Ratcliffe's Case*, *Strange*, 267; the general effect of which is, that, independent of the impediments to taking and acquiring estates by Catholics, there is nothing in the several statutes to prevent a Catholic from aliening an estate if he once got possession of it. His lordship then referred to the arguments of the Attorney-General (of counsel for the defendant), that there was to be found in certain other statutes indirect Parliamentary authority, by implication, for the proposition that Catholics could not alienate their estates: as the statutes of Elizabeth against Popish Recusants, the 1st Geo. I., chap. 55; the 3rd Geo. I., chap. 18: and having shown that the effect of these statutes did not touch the general question of the power to alienate, proceeded:—

We are thus brought back again to the question whether in the 11th and 12th William III., there is anything which prohibits alienation when once the estate has got into a Catholic. It appears to me plain and clear that there is nothing of the kind. Therefore it seems to me that if we look to the general law, it is impossible to say that this restraint on alienation by Catholics, which was foreign to the general

law, can be considered as having been introduced into this private Act of special legislation as a leaf taken from the public statute-book. But, besides this, if we look at the true history of the passing of this private Act, the whole of this very ingenious edifice crumbles to pieces and falls to the ground; and although I quite concur with Sir Richard Bethell that we ought to construe and must construe this Act with reference to its own contents and its own contents alone, yet when we are asked to travel out of the Act and to apply to it, with a view to its construction, the general existing law relating to Catholics, on the ground that the clause in question was introduced as a part of the general existing law, then, for the purpose of ascertaining whether such a representation is correct, and for that purpose only, it becomes essential to inquire what were the facts attending this piece of private legislation, or, to speak more correctly, of legislation for private purposes.

We have the history of the case before us. Evidence of the facts was tendered by the defendants, and was admitted, all objection to its reception being waived, as I think most judiciously and politically, by the counsel for the plaintiff. Now the history of the case is this:—On the death of the Duke of Shrewsbury, in 1717, the settlement of 1700, which he had effected, of course came into operation; but, unfortunately, as regards their temporal interests—in that sense of the word only do I use the word unfortunately—those who were entitled to take were Roman Catholics, and affected by the Roman Catholic

Disability Acts. It appears that Lord Harcourt, who took an interest in the affairs of this family, had an interview, shortly after the duke's death, with a gentleman named Pigott, a conveyancer and eminent practitioner in his day, who was a Roman Catholic, and no doubt was in the confidence of Roman Catholic families, and consulted by them on matters relating to their estates. Lord Harcourt pointed out to Mr. Pigott the disability under which those who were to take under the Duke's settlement laboured, observing that it was a great pity—I think that was the expression—that the provisions of the settlement were such as they were, because those who were to take under it were Roman Catholics, and therefore disabled. Upon this Mr. Pigott suggested that there should be an Estate Bill, as there had been in the Arundel case, for the purpose of annexing the estates to the title and getting over the difficulty of the incapacity of those who were to take the estates and enjoy them. Lord Harcourt saw the Bishop of Salisbury upon it; the bishop consulted his son, who was at that time, I think, Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales, and, after this consultation with his son, it appears a conference took place between the bishop and Mr. Pigott. The Bishop of Salisbury had no objection to assist in securing those who were entitled to the present estate against the possible contingency of the Protestant next of kin seeking to invade their estates; but he stipulated for and insisted on a condition, that, whereas, in the event of the issue of George and John, who were next in succession to the earldom, failing, the earldom

would necessarily come to him, the estates of the late Duke of Shrewsbury, and which were now to be enjoyed by these persons, should be annexed to the earldom, so that they should come to him and his heirs. And I think we may safely conclude that his purpose was that they should be inseparably annexed to the earldom—because it must have been palpable to so sagacious a man as the bishop, that in the state of religious animosity which then prevailed between Catholics and Protestants, a Catholic tenant in tail, upon the probability of a failure of issue, would prefer to aliene the estates, rather than that they should come to so remote a kinsman, and that kinsman a Protestant ecclesiastic. One readily understands, therefore, why the bishop should stipulate that the estates should be inseparably annexed to the earldom. The condition has been denounced as a hard one; perhaps it was so; but with that we have nothing to do. Some repugnance seems to have been entertained to the proposal, and we find that more than one conference took place between the bishop and Mr. Pigott, and a Mr. Webber, who was employed as a go-between; but the bishop stood to his condition, and said that he had seen the King, and would not assent on any other terms; and the result was that his terms were agreed to. Thereupon, the indenture of 1718, which was partly a settlement of the estates, and partly an agreement between the parties concerned, that the bishop should go to Parliament to obtain a private Act to carry out the common purpose, was executed; and accordingly a Bill was after-

wards introduced on the petition of Earl Gilbert and the bishop, but in point of fact promoted and prosecuted on the part of the bishop himself.

While the matter was pending before the committee, a petition was presented by Lord Fitzwilliam, the uncle of the infant heir of George,—for in the interval between the indenture of 1718, and the bringing in the Bill before Parliament, the marriage, upon the contemplation of which the settlement of 1718 was executed, had taken place, and a child had been born of that marriage—a boy, and consequently heir in tail under the settlement of 1700, as well as under the settlement of 1718, if the latter should receive the sanction of the Legislature by the proposed Act of Parliament. Lord Fitzwilliam presented a petition on behalf of the infant heir, pointing out that his rights would be interfered with, and therefore opposing the Bill, which went to take away the power of alienation. In the course of the argument before the committee, Mr. Peere Williams, who was counsel for the petitioner against the Bill, urged the rights of the infant, and pressed upon the committee that they should not, by taking away from him the power of alienating the estates, remove the strong inducement which there would be to bring up the heir to these great estates as a Protestant. And then was introduced this proviso upon the enactment prohibiting alienation, namely, that the tenants in tail should have—of course they did not put it simply that this boy should have, but that any person in the same position should have—the power of alienating the estates, if they would

take the oaths which in those days were the test of adherence to the Protestant faith. Now all this clearly shows, to my mind at least, that this was a matter not of general but of special legislation. I quite agree with my learned brother Shee and Sir Richard Bethell that the proviso was intended to apply to Catholics—not, as it seems to me, with reference to the general law of the land, because, as I have already pointed out, by the general law Catholics were under no incapacity to alienate except such as arose from the disability to take, but, as a matter of special legislation, adapted to the particular case of the Catholic tenants in tail of these estates, prompted, perhaps, by the desire not altogether to supersede and set at naught the rights of this infant tenant in tail, thus prominently brought under the attention and consideration of the committee, yet at the same time to clog them with a condition which should render the power of alienation practically impossible. The original intention of the Bill, as we know, was that the restraint on alienation should be absolute. For the bishop, who was the promoter of this Bill, apprehended that if the estate tail remained in the hands of a Catholic without a restraint upon alienation, it would, in all human probability, in the event of failure of issue, be alienated, so that it should never come to the Protestant line. But when the rights of the infant tenant in tail were strongly urged, and Mr. Peere Williams suggested that the reservation of the right of alienation might be made an inducement to bring up the heir as a Protestant, the bishop was pro-

bably not unwilling to solve the difficulty by getting a condition annexed which he knew would never be satisfied. All this, it is true, is, more or less, matter of surmise and speculation; but it is plain that it was with reference specially to this infant that this proviso was introduced. I cannot, therefore, looking at the history of the case, any more than I can, looking at what was then the state of the general law, come to the conclusion that the restraint on alienation in this estate Act was introduced for the purpose of making the Act, reference being had to the prior enabling clause, conformable to the general law relating to Catholics.

But there is a further consideration which appears to me conclusive on this point. Although I agree that the proviso was introduced to meet the case of Catholics, because the party whose right of alienation it was the object to take away happened to be a Catholic, yet the provision as it stands is general, without any distinction of Catholic and Protestant. Though framed on the model of the fourth section of the 11 and 12 Will. III., it contains no reference to education in or profession of the Popish religion, such as occurs in the Act of William. The section begins with a general prohibition of alienation, but then goes on to provide that any parties who will take certain oaths and make a certain declaration shall be relieved from the disability. Suppose that any one of these Catholic tenants had been converted to Protestantism, and had brought up his son a Protestant; can it be denied that if such Protestant on attaining 18

had taken the oaths and made the declaration, he would have been able to aliene? But, if the proviso would have been available to Protestant as well as to Catholic, it cannot have been introduced as part of the general law directed solely against Catholics.

But if the case does not come within the general law, the 10th of George IV., c. 7, can have no operation upon it. If either it formed no part of the general law that Catholics should not alienate, or if it be clear, looking at the history of this legislation, that this proviso was not introduced as part of the general law, but was a condition imposed by way of special legislation in this particular case, then it seems to me plain that the 10th of George IV. cannot affect the question. For, I take it to be quite clear that all that the 10th of George IV. was intended to effect, when it repealed the acts which required certain oaths and declarations as the condition of the exercise of civil rights, and provided that no oaths should be required of Catholics to enable them to hold property other than were required from the rest of the King's subjects, was to remove disabilities imposed by the general law. It never was intended to have, and cannot be held to have, the effect of getting rid of that which was a special provision in a settlement. There can be no difference in this respect between a settlement by a private Act and an ordinary settlement by deed. Now, suppose a man had settled or devised his estates upon certain limitations, but had made it a condition precedent to the taking of the estates, that any person who was to take should profess the Pro-

testant faith, and evidence that faith by certain specified acts and observances; I apprehend it to be perfectly clear that a general enactment removing disabilities created by the general law of the land never could be taken to apply to a disability thus specially created by will or settlement. A condition annexed to the enjoyment of an estate cannot be affected by an act of the legislature, unless the legislation is directed to the condition thus specially created, and not merely to disabilities created by the general law. A man has a right to annex, by what I may call his private enactment, the terms and conditions upon which that which it is of his own free will to grant or withhold shall be taken, and you cannot get rid of such conditions unless by legislative enactment specially directed to the particular case or some particular class of cases to which it belongs. Considering, therefore, the 8th section of this Private Estate Act as a matter of special and not of public legislation, I am clearly of opinion that its effect cannot be got rid of by that which was applicable only to the disability imposed on Catholics by the general law.

It is urged, however, as an argument in favour of the defendants, that by the effect of the 10th of George IV., c. 7, the performance of the condition has become impossible. Assuming this for a moment, it seems to me to follow as a necessary consequence in point of law that alienation has become impossible. There is here a condition precedent upon alienation, and it is elementary knowledge that a condition precedent is a thing which cannot

be got over. The law is stated by Blackstone in his usual lucid manner. He says, "Express conditions, if they be impossible at the time of their creation, or afterwards become impossible by the act of God or the act of the grantor himself, or if they be contrary to law, or repugnant to the nature of the estate, are void. In any of which cases, if they be condition subsequent, that is, to be performed after the estate is vested, the estate shall become absolute in the tenant. As, if a grant be made to a man in fee simple, on condition that unless he goes to Rome in twenty-four hours, or unless he marries with Jane S. by such a day (within which time the woman dies, or the grantor marries her himself); or unless he kills another; or in case he aliens in fee; that then, and in any of such cases, the estate shall be vacated and determined: here the condition is void, and the estate made absolute in the feoffee. For he has by the grant the estate vested in him, which shall not be defeated afterwards, by a condition either impossible, illegal, or repugnant. But if the condition be precedent, or to be performed before the estate vests; as a grant to a man, that if he kills another or goes to Rome in a day, he shall have an estate in fee; here, the void condition being precedent, the estate which depends thereon is also void, and the grantee shall take nothing by the grant; for he has no estate until the condition be performed." In the recent case of *Egerton against the Earl of Brownlow*, in the 4th volume of the *House of Lords' Cases*, at page 120, Mr. Baron Parke fully confirms this doctrine.

Speaking of a condition, he says, "Supposing it to be illegal, if it be a contingency or condition precedent and the event does not happen, or if it be impossible, and therefore cannot happen, the party never obtains the estate; if it be a condition subsequent, he never loses what he has got." This I take to be the true rule of law upon this subject.

Now here we have an estate tail, from which the incident of alienability is taken away by positive enactment, but to which alienability may be restored upon the performance of a condition precedent. If the performance of the condition precedent is prevented, no matter how, and the condition does not take effect, that which was conditioned upon it cannot possibly take effect either. It cannot, therefore, avail the defendants to say that the condition has become impossible. But I think it would be going a great way to say that it had become impossible. Though by the general law it has been rendered wholly unnecessary that any oath should be taken or any declaration be made by Catholics as a condition either of taking estates or of aliening them, all that was done was to dispense with oaths and declarations; there was nothing to make them illegal. If taking the estate was conditioned upon taking these oaths and making this declaration, I do not see anything to prohibit a party from taking the oaths and making the declaration in order to entitle himself to alienate by the performance of the condition. But however this may be, if impossibility of performance of the condition has supervened, it seems to me that

in point of law the power to alienate is gone.

It was, however, perhaps unnecessary to advert to this head of argument; for if the case does not fall under the general law, and the 8th section of the 6th of Geo. I. is not affected by the 10th of Geo. IV., chap. 7, the case of the defendants falls entirely to the ground. For, subsequently to the passing of the 10th of Geo. IV., c. 7, a private estate Act of the 6th and 7th Vict., chap. 28, was obtained by John the 16th earl, the then tenant in tail in possession of these estates, whereby the proviso of the 8th section of the 6th Geo. I., c. 29, which qualifies what would otherwise be an absolute restraint on alienation, was in terms repealed. I quite go along with the argument of the learned counsel for the defendants, that, if the effect of the 10th Geo. IV., chap. 7, had been to get rid altogether of the restraint on alienation imposed by sect. 8 of the 6th of Geo. I., chap. 29, the mere enactment of a private estate Act professing to repeal a portion of that clause, upon a mistaken assumption that the whole continued to be the law, would not have the effect of restoring so much of the clause as it professed to leave untouched. I quite concur in the argument that a mistake as to the state of the law on the part of the Legislature in a private Act of Parliament—nay, I may say, upon the authority of the case to which Mr. Grant, as *amicus curiæ*, was good enough to direct our attention yesterday, even in a public Act—and legislation founded on such mistake, would not have the effect of making that the law which the

Legislature had erroneously assumed to be so. If, therefore, the 8th section and the restraint imposed by it had been removed by the general legislation of the 10th Geo. IV., I agree that the clause of the private Act of the 6th and 7th Vict. would not have the effect of renewing the disability. But if I am right in the conclusion at which I have arrived on the grounds I have explained, and the 8th section of the 6th of Geo. I. was not affected by the 10th of Geo. IV., then the private estate Act of the 6th and 7th Victoria having repealed the qualifying part of the clause, and having left the positive enactment against alienation unqualified and without any modification, the power to alienate upon the performance of the specified condition is at an end, and the possibility of alienation under any circumstances whatever is for ever done away with.

It seems to me, therefore, upon these grounds, that we must decide in favour of the plaintiff, and discharge this Rule; and I have the less reluctance in doing so, because I feel satisfied that this decision is in conformity with the justice and equity of the case. I will not say that there was a family compact, if that expression is objected to, but I think it clear, upon all the facts, that there was a parliamentary compact in this case. The Catholic tenants, whether for life or in tail, under the settlement of 1700, found themselves in a position in which the enjoyment of their estates might at any moment be invaded and interfered with by the Protestant next of kin. They desired to enjoy immunity from this unhappy state of things. At

that time of day, when men had not learned the great and salutary lesson that they may worship the same God side by side, according to their respective faiths and forms of worship, in amity and peace, people did not foresee that a time would come when these penal laws—which the animosity of religious warfare, and the struggle, as it were, of life and death, for the existence of the one religion or the other, if they did not render necessary, at all events excused—would in process of time become unnecessary and would be repealed. At that time, when every one looked forward to the continuance of those laws, it was a matter of the greatest possible moment and importance to these Roman Catholic proprietors to receive protection and immunity against the operation of the then existing law, which disabled them from enjoying their estates. They obtained that protection through the intervention and influence of one who was interested in a particular settlement of these estates—they obtained it through the special legislation of Parliament at his instance and procurement. They obtained it, however, as I read the Act of Parliament, on the condition that the estates should be inalienable, except on a contingency at that time most improbable—namely, the conversion at an early age of the successors of those to whom the estates stood limited from the Catholic to the Protestant faith. Under this private and special legislation the Roman Catholic proprietors enjoyed those estates during a long series of years, when, but for it, their enjoyment and possession might at any moment have been interfered with

in a manner most prejudicial and disastrous to themselves.

I cannot regret, then, that the conclusion which I arrive at, and which I trust I have arrived at independently of any other considerations than those which, sitting here to interpret the law, are the only ones which should influence my mind, should carry with it the consequence, that those who have had the benefit shall pay the price, that those who have had the uninterrupted enjoyment of these estates shall abide by the condition on which that enjoyment was secured to them.

On account of the extraordinary novelty and importance of the case, each of the three puisne Justices of the Court who had heard the arguments in the cause (Mr. Justice Willes, Mr. Justice Williams, and Mr. Justice Byles,) delivered a full judgment, in which each dealt with the several points as they assumed more or less prominence to his view. In the conclusion, many of the points taken by the Lord Chief Justice in his general judgment were much enlarged and illustrated; but as no additional principle was stated, it is unnecessary to do more than to say that these learned Judges concurred with the Lord Chief Justice in every point.

The rule *Nisi* obtained by the defendants to enter the verdict for them, was therefore discharged.

THE THELLUSSON WILL CASE.

The most ancient and most enduring, and, in many respects, the most extraordinary of Eng-

lish lawsuits, has come to a final end and determination. The great Thellusson Will Case was a sound of note to our grandfathers, and of wide-eyed astonishment to our fathers; but to ourselves there has been a long void, a chasm of time connected from bank to bank by a suspension bridge of chancery suits, traversed only by lawyers and the few heirs to the immense estates, who eagerly peered into the drear abyss only to see the torrent of their fortunes rush intangibly by. The case has been well described by one of the admirable essayists who moralize the lessons of the day:—*

“Ye who listen with credulity to the whispers of vanity, and pursue with eagerness the phantom of a name, attend to the history of one richer than Rasseles,—even to the history of one Peter Thellusson, late of the city of London, merchant.

“It is now sixty-two years since Peter Thellusson took stock of his worldly possessions, and found that he had 600,000*l.* in money, and land of the annual value of 4500*l.* Peter Thellusson had satisfied the ordinary ambition of an English *bourgeois*—he had founded a family. Peter Isaac, the son of his youth, and the prop of his house, was heir to 35,000*l.* a year in money and land; and might claim to be a born gentleman. Peers and peeresses might hereafter spring in intermediate succession from the loins of that denizen of a dingy little back parlour behind the Bank. The best men upon ‘Change envied the rich and prosperous Peter Thellusson,

* The *Times*, July 5.

who had no object of ambition unsatisfied. Peter was of a different mind; he had not nearly money enough. Let other men be satisfied to found one family; Peter was lucky enough to have three sons, and he would found three families. It was not that he loved his sons, or his sons' sons; but it was the hope and desire of this magnificently posthumous miser to associate his name in future generations with three colossal fortunes. If he did not love his sons, he did not hate them; he was simply indifferent to everything except to his one cherished object. Peter Thellusson took the very best legal advice, and made a will. He left a few trifling legacies, probably to show that no unnatural antipathy to his children tainted that will with mania. But his great fortune was all conveyed to trustees. It was to accumulate until every man, woman, and child of the offspring of Peter, and alive or begotten at the moment of Peter's death, should also be defunct. No one of the children or grandchildren who had ever looked Peter in the face, or trembled in his presence, or squalled at the sound of his harsh, hard voice, should ever be the richer for Peter's wealth. 'And the rich man also died.' Twelve months after making this will, and sixty-one years from the present time, Peter was gathered to his unknown fathers. The will was opened, and created sensations which vibrated through the land in widening circles. Our law books picture to us the blank disappointment of the then living relatives, the gentle cachinnations of a past generation of lawyers, and the gaping wonder

of the general public. There were three sons and six grandsons of this malignant old merchant then alive—all destined to live the life of Tantalus; to see this great pagoda-tree growing up before them, yet never to pluck one unit of its fruit. The terms of the will enjoined, that when the last survivor of all the nine children and grandchildren should yield up his breath, then the charm was to end; the great mountain of accumulated wealth was to be divided into three portions, and one-third was to be given to each of the 'eldest male lineal descendants' of his three sons. Having thus done what he liked with his own, and excluded all his living progeny from all benefit, he ends with a whine to the Legislature worthy of Shylock appealing against mercy—he had earned his money with honesty and industry, and he hoped the Legislature would not alter his will. Of course, the first thing that followed was a chancery suit of the fattest bulk. The common-sense view of the case would have been to set aside the will, as the product of a diseased mind—a mind rendered morbid as to its disposing powers by dwelling upon an irrational object. But Lords Loughborough and Alvanley and Eldon, and Judges of kindred sympathies, seem to have been led by their love of art to admire the skill with which the technicalities of our blessed real property law had been adapted to the object of this old trader. Perhaps, also, they saw something eminently sane and matter-of-fact in this good old sordid vice of accumulation, or were excited to admiration by seeing

the meanest vice of man expanded into something like sublimity in its gigantesque proportions. The litigation went up to the House of Lords, and the will was confirmed. This affair naturally made a great noise. The Legislature took it up, and, although they would not set aside the will by an *ex post facto* law, they branded Peter Thellusson's memory with the imputation of 'vanity, illiberality, and folly;' and enacted by statute, 39th and 40th of George III., cap. 98, that the power of devising property for the purpose of accumulation shall be restrained in general to twenty-one years after the death of the testator. Persons of an arithmetical and statistical turn of mind also occupied themselves with the matter, and, with the aid of life insurance tables and Cocker, they calculated that this fund, accumulating at compound interest, could not amount to less than nineteen millions at the moment of distribution, and would very probably reach the tremendous figure of thirty-two millions. But 'nothing is so false as facts, except figures.' The calculators had forgotten to take account of that unknown quantity which must, in practical matters, be represented, not by the letter '*x*,' but by the word 'litigation.' Contemporaneously with the chancery suit to set aside the will there was a cross-suit to have the trusts of the will performed under the direction of the Court of Chancery. That suit is now sixty years old, and, although children and grandchildren are dead, the suit is as hale and lively as it was in their earliest youth. That suit was

the true heir to Peter Thellusson, and it is still spending his money like a frolicsome young cornet.

"The last survivor of the nine lives died in February, 1856, and four new bills were immediately filed. The property is now to be divided, not into thirds, but into moieties. There is, however, a question raised as to who is entitled. Who were the eldest male lineal descendants of old Peter Thellusson in February, 1856? There are two who are eldest in point of lineage, and two who are eldest in point of personal age. This point is still *sub judice*. It would not be very difficult to guess how it will be decided; but that is no matter of ours, nor would it have been a matter of the least interest to old Peter Thellusson. His object was to make the heap very large; he evidently cared not one lock of wool as to which of his descendants might be the possessors. The public interest in this long line of litigation is confined to its general aspect. Peter Thellusson's clever scheme has turned out a foolish failure. No single Thellusson will stalk over the land, overshadowing our dukes and crushing our barons by the magnitude of his territorial possessions. No thirty-two millions of money are expanded into broad acres, where men may travel and say—'Behold the conquests of the great Peter Thellusson.' Whether Lord Rendlesham and Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson divide the estate as the eldest in lineage, or whether Thomas and Arthur take as eldest in years, we should equally desire to be able to call up old Peter Thellusson to see the division of his antici-

pated accumulations. The court of Chancery has so clipped and pollarded his oak, that it is not much larger than when he left it. It would be fit punishment for that purse-proud, vain, cruel old man, to see that he disinherited his own children only to fatten a generation of lawyers; that he was the dupe of his own subtlety, and that his name, instead of being associated with the foundation of a house of fabulous wealth, is only known in connection with an abortive scheme of vulgar vanity."

The popular language of this admirable paper contains a clear account of Peter Thellusson's will; but the demerits of the case and the absurdity of the arrangements become more clear when set forth in the proper jargon of the law. The ambitious miser devised to trustees all his real estates and the residue of his personal estate to be converted into real estate, upon trust, to accumulate the rents and profits during the lives of his three sons, Peter Isaac, George Woodford, and Charles, and of their sons, and the issue of such sons of the testator's three sons living at or born in due time after his death; and after the death of the survivor of such several persons to make an equal partition of the trust premises; and he directed—

"The whole thereof divided into three lots of equal value, or as near thereto as possible, and that the premises contained in one of such allotments shall be conveyed to the use of the eldest male lineal descendant then living (and who shall be entitled to the first choice of such allotments) of my said son Peter Isaac

Thellusson in tail male, with remainder to the second, third, and fourth, and all and every other male lineal descendant or descendants (who shall be incapable of taking as heir in tail male of any of the persons to whom a prior estate is thereby directed to be limited) of my said son Peter Isaac Thellusson successively in tail male, with remainder in equal moieties to the eldest and every other male lineal descendant or descendants then living of my said sons George Woodford Thellusson and Charles Thellusson, as tenants in common in tail male, in the same manner as hereinbefore directed, with respect to the eldest and every other male lineal descendant and descendants of my said son Peter Isaac Thellusson, with cross remainders, between or among such male lineal descendants as aforesaid of my said sons George Woodford Thellusson and Charles Thellusson in tail male, or, in case there shall be but one such male lineal descendant, then to such one in tail male with remainder to the use of them, the said Matthew Woodford, James Stanley, and Emperor John Alexander Woodford, their heirs and assigns for ever, upon the trust and to and for the intents and purposes hereinafter mentioned and expressed and declared of and concerning the same."

In consequence of the failure of male lineal descendants of George Woodford, the second son, when the period of partition arrived, the trust property became divisible into two lots only, one of which was to be conveyed to the "eldest male lineal descendant" of the eldest son Peter Isaac, the other to the

"eldest male lineal descendant" of the youngest son Charles.

In the suit "*The Hon. Arthur Thellusson v. Lord Rendlesham and others*," the question was, who was the "eldest male lineal descendant" of Peter Isaac. The plaintiff, who was born in 1801, and was the only surviving son of Peter Isaac, the first Lord Rendlesham, the eldest son of the testator, claimed to have one of the lots conveyed to him as the *eldest* male lineal descendant; the defendant, Lord Rendlesham, who was born in 1840, and was the only son of Frederick, third Lord Rendlesham, an elder son of Peter Isaac, contended that, though he was younger than the plaintiff in age, he was the eldest male lineal descendant according to the true construction of the will, as being the son of the plaintiff's elder brother, and therefore older in blood.

The cause was first heard before the Master of the Rolls, who decided in favour of Lord Rendlesham, the defendant. The cause was brought on appeal before the House of Lords, happily for the litigants the court of supreme and final jurisdiction. So great a cause, distinguished by such remarkable peculiarities, received all honours at their Lordships' hands. It was twice argued before their Lordships, sitting with the Judges as assessors, by the ablest counsel that wealth could command; and their Lordships, by the advice of the Lord Chancellor, put the following questions to the learned Judges:—

"First. Whether the devise by the testator of his lands, tenements, and hereditaments after the decease of the several person

during whose lives the rents and profits of the same were directed to be accumulated (if it had been a devise of legal estates) to the eldest male lineal descendant then living of Peter Isaac Thellusson, George Woodford Thellusson, and Charles Thellusson respectively in tail male, is capable of an intelligible construction, or is void for uncertainty.

"Second. If at the time directed by the testator for the division of the estates into three lots, and for the conveyance to be made thereof, Peter Isaac Thellusson had had three sons, all of whom were dead, and the eldest of the three sons had left a son under age, and the second son had left a son of 21 years of age, and the third son had left a son of 30 years of age, and supposing it had been a devise of legal estates, which of the sons of the three sons would have been entitled to take under the devise?"

The learned Lords, having taken time to consider, delivered their several opinions. In answer to the first question, they were unanimous that the devise was capable of an intelligible construction. With regard to the second question, there was a diversity of opinion; but the majority concurred in holding that the word "eldest" used in the will as descriptive of the person who is to take a lot as a purchaser, when the time of accumulation ceased, does not mean the oldest man among his male lineal descendants, but that the testator meant and intended that the person who would be heir-at-law of Peter Isaac in tail male should take one of the lots as purchaser, by the designation of his eldest male lineal descendant.

Z

On the 9th June, 1859, just sixty-two years after the cruel and insane old man had bequeathed his legacy of dispute and litigation to his children and his children's children, the House of Lords put an end to his power of inflicting further mischief by pronouncing their final judgment.

Lord Cranworth, after stating the will, and the questions that had arisen upon it, said that it was plainly the testator's object, by an unprecedented accumulation, to create enormous wealth for the purpose of founding three families, but beyond that there was nothing to be discovered in the will indicating any capricious intention as to who should take the property. On the contrary, everything showed that the testator had the ordinary rules of succession in his mind. The gift was confined to males—the persons benefited were to take in tail male only. The first choice of the estate, after the trustees should have made the division, was given to the representative of the eldest son, and to him, too, was given the first preference in presenting to the living. And the succession of the sons after the deaths was to follow the same rule. The construction contended for by the appellant would contradict the whole of this arrangement, and would postpone the estate of the present Lord Rendlesham to that of his uncle, they being the only male lineal descendants of Peter Isaac, to whom estates by purchase were limited by the will. Had there been more than two persons to take, the anomalous nature of the way in which they were to take (could the appellant's construction have been adopted) would have been

more apparent. It was impossible to suppose that the testator could have intended that there should be such a shifting of the possessors of the estates as must follow the adoption of the appellant's construction. It was no answer to this objection to say, that every devisee in succession would be tenant in tail male, and so might acquire the fee, for there might happen many circumstances which would prevent him doing so, and, at all events, it was not to be supposed that the testator had created capricious limitations in the belief that their capriciousness would be rendered inoperative by the act of the first taker. On the other hand, as the testator must of course have wished that the limitations he had created should be observed, there could be little doubt that the tendency to alter limitations that were of the ordinary kind and not capricious, being less than the tendency to alter those that were capricious, would of itself suggest to him a preference for limitations of the former kind. Reading the will, therefore, with every inclination to follow the rule that words must have their ordinary meaning assigned to them, he felt no doubt that the meaning to be given to these words must be that which was the ordinary construction of such a devise, and the estate must be held to go to the person who at the specified time was heir male of the body of Peter Isaac. The words were technical, they were used technically, and they must have their ordinary technical meaning assigned to them, and taken to mean descent in the male line according to the ordinary course of law. The decision of Lord Eldon on the

advowson clause was exactly in point with the construction to be put on the clause now under discussion. The word "eldest" did not mean oldest in point of age, but must be taken to mean "first," namely, the person first entitled to succeed according to the ordinary rules of descent. The decree of the Court below must therefore be affirmed.

Lord St. Leonards concurred, expressing a strong opinion that the question as to the alleged uncertainty of the devise had been concluded by the decision which took place in 1825. As to the other question, what was the meaning of the words? he was of opinion that, as they were the words of a lawyer, they must receive a lawyer's construction. But in truth there was not an educated man in the country who, knowing what the ordinary modes of settlement were, would not put the same meaning upon them. It was true that "eldest," as a mere word, might have two interpretations; it might mean eldest in point of age without reference to primogeniture. But in reference to settlements, it never did mean that. This will was a settlement of real estate. And nobody could doubt that here the testator really intended the eldest son of Peter Isaac as the first tenant in tail, and so went on adopting the rule of primogeniture. The decision on the advowson clause was in entire conformity with this construction, and the clause itself showed in a very clear manner the testator's preference for primogeniture over mere age.

Lord Wensleydale was of the same opinion. The word "eldest" must here be construed as having

reference to primogeniture, and he said this with the full intention of adhering to the rule laid down by Mr. Justice Burton in *Warburton v. Loveland* (1 Hudson & Brook (Jr.) 648 s. c. 2, Dow. & Cl. 480), and adopted in the most recent instance, in *Grey v. Pearson*. "Eldest" did not necessarily mean oldest in point of age, for even applied to an individual having a particular character, it had a different meaning. The eldest magistrate or officer might not mean him who had lived the greatest number of years, nor even him who had filled the office for the longest time, for it might indicate rank only, and the "eldest earl of England" would not mean him who was most advanced in years, but the eldest in point of family origin—the premier earl. Here, used as it was with other words, it meant, not the eldest in age, but the eldest in heritable blood in the male line. As to the advowson clause, if any semblance of argument of a different sort was to be deduced from that clause, it was explained by this, that the testator was manifestly labouring under the erroneous belief that an infant could not present, and so framed this clause that by the power of presentation being for the time lodged in a person legally able to make it, the presentation should not go out of the family. There was no uncertainty in the will, nor any intestacy as to any part of it.

Lord Brougham would not take part in the decision as he had not heard the whole of the argument. But the decision entirely accorded with the impression existing in his mind, formed upon the hearing of that

portion of the case in the hearing of which he had taken part.

Decree of the Court below affirmed.

II.—CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Murder by poison has formed a very noticeable feature in our recent criminal annals. The trials of Palmer and Dove, in 1856, of Madeleine Smith, in 1857, and those of Smethurst and Royal in the present year, besides their general notoriety, have attracted the attention of the legal profession and of chymists and pathologists in no common degree. The case of Madeleine Smith, notwithstanding the great interest it excited, is in fact of least importance, since there was no question that l'Angelier was killed by a coarse dose of arsenic, and the conviction or acquittal of the accused rested solely on the force of the incriminatory evidence. But in the other three cases, scientific questions of the most difficult character arose, presenting specific differences well worthy of consideration. In Palmer's case, the chief questions belonging to medical jurisprudence were these—one, whether the convulsions of which Cooke died were such that they would have been produced by strychnia, and could not have been produced by any other extrinsic cause, or by natural causes; the other, whether if strychnia had been administered to him, it was a necessary consequence that strychnia should have been detected in his body. In the Leeds case, the death of Mrs. Dove was unquestionably due to strychnia, and strychnia was discovered in considerable quantity. The Rich-

mond poisoning case, where death was alleged to have been caused by arsenic, presents considerable analogy to the first strychnia case, inasmuch as the symptoms were alleged to be such as would have been produced by arsenic, and could have been produced by no other irritant poison or by natural causes; yet (except as a very doubtful result) no arsenic was discovered in the corpse. In this, as in Palmer's case, many scientific authorities were of opinion that the symptoms were such as might have originated in natural causes—such as the deceased's subsequently discovered pregnancy—and that if arsenic had been administered, traces of it must have been discovered. Royal's case presents entirely novel features in accusations of this kind. It was the unanimous opinion of the medical witnesses produced by the Crown (the accused called none), that death in this case was not due to natural causes, but to the administration of some irritant poison; but the subsequent examination of the body of the deceased did not disclose the administration of any poison whatever, whether mineral or vegetable; but there was discovered a secreted fluid of a highly poisonous nature, and the intestines were in a state of general inflammation, such as has not been found save where some irritant poison has been taken. What this poisonous secretion was, the scientific witnesses were entirely unable to discover; neither could they offer any proof whether it was a cause of the surrounding disease or was a consequent of it. The peculiarities of these cases suggest a wide field for

inquiry in this region of science; and it greatly concerns the security of mankind and the peace of society that a satisfactory solution of the questions involved should be speedily arrived at.

THE RICHMOND POISON- ING CASE.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT,

*July 7 and 8; August 15, 16, 17,
18 and 19; and November 30.*

(Before the Lord Chief Baron.)

As the several proceedings against the accused extended over a period little short of five months, and occupied in their actual decision eight days, any attempt to comprise the whole case within the limits which can here be assigned to it would be futile—and the same remarks apply to the following case of *Royal*—all that can be attempted is to give so much of the arguments of counsel, and the facts proved by the witnesses, as will justify the conclusions at which the juries arrived, and the course taken by the authorities.

By a singular accident, the interest of the public in the Richmond case, already highly excited, was held in suspense and greatly raised, by the abrupt close of the first trial, and by the very unusual circumstance of an alleged murderer being tried twice for the same offence on the same indictment.

The first trial commenced at the Central Criminal Court on the 7th of July, before Chief Baron Pollock.

Thomas Smethurst, 48 years of age, surgeon, was indicted for the wilful murder of Isabella Bankes.

The prisoner was a person of small stature and insignificant appearance, with reddish brown moustaches. Although his age was stated in the calendar to be 48, there is strong reason to suppose that he was several years older. The prisoner, though appearing careworn, maintained great self-possession throughout the proceedings, particularly during the second trial.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine, after impressing upon the jury the grave responsibility which attached to them in deciding on so important a case, said that the charge he was about to prefer was one of a most serious character; the allegation of it was, that the prisoner at the bar took away the life of a fellow-creature by poison, and likewise contrived to throw around the means he resorted to to destroy life some more than ordinary difficulties in the detection of the crime, and, in order to effect this purpose, he had availed himself of the knowledge he possessed, and made use of a slow irritant poison, which he administered with his own hands, until, by the accumulation of poison and irritation, the poor woman sunk and died; and the jury, probably, would be of opinion, when they had heard the evidence, that every means was taken by him from the beginning to the end to shroud the whole affair in the deepest mystery. The prisoner was represented to be a member of the medical profession; he had a considerable knowledge of medicine, and was known as Dr. Smethurst. He was a married man, and had a wife considerably older than himself, who was now living. At the time when he should first

refer to Dr. Smethurst he was living with his wife at a respectable lodging-house in Rifle-terrace, Bayswater. While they were living there, Miss Isabella Bankes, the lady into the circumstances attending whose death they were about to inquire, also came there to reside. She was a lady of very respectable family, and was possessed of property under her own control to the extent of 1700*l.* or 1800*l.*, and of a life interest in 5000*l.*, which at her death went to other members of her family. In the autumn of 1858 Miss Bankes went to reside in the lodging-house in which Dr. Smethurst and his wife were living, and an intimacy sprung up between the parties. In November the landlady, considering there was too great an intimacy existing between Dr. Smethurst and Miss Bankes, spoke to her about it, and the result was that that lady left the house. On the 9th of December Miss Bankes and the prisoner went to a church at Battersea, and were married; and two days after went to reside together at Richmond. It was evident that Dr. Smethurst never intended this to be a permanent marriage, and that he would prove by calling their attention to a letter to his wife, which was found upon him when he was taken into custody. If he did not contemplate a permanent marriage with the defendant it would be for the jury to say what bearing that would have on their minds when taken in conjunction with the other matters relating to the charge. From the time of their marriage, nothing was heard of them till the 28th January, when Miss Louisa Bankes, the sister of Miss Bankes, received

a letter from her, but not addressed from the place where they were living. On the 15th of February she received another letter from her. At that time Miss Bankes and Dr. Smethurst were living together as man and wife, at Old Palace Gardens, Richmond. Miss Bankes was then in good health; but about the 28th of March her illness commenced. On the 3rd of April Dr. Smethurst decided to have medical advice. The landlady advised calling in Dr. Julius, as he and his partner, Dr. Bird, were the most eminent practitioners in Richmond. Accordingly Drs. Julius and Bird were called in. The former treated her in the usual way for diarrhoea, the complaint he understood she was suffering from. He obtained all his information from Dr. Smethurst with regard to the lady's symptoms, and he received them with confidence, as Dr. Smethurst professed great medical knowledge. Dr. Julius consulted with him all through; he took the most active part in the matter, and sometimes pressed upon them the use of various medicines. But neither Dr. Julius nor Dr. Bird, in any of their visits, had ever been allowed to be alone with their patient. On the 15th of April the parties left Old Palace Gardens, and went to reside at 10, Alma-villas. Miss Bankes was very weak then, and had to be taken in a cab. She was carried up stairs, and never after came down alive. Dr. Julius, when he found that the remedies which he applied to the deceased had a directly contrary effect to what they were intended, requested Dr. Bird to see her, but did not mention his own suspicions on

the subject although they were very strong. On the 18th of April Dr. Bird saw her, and prescribed for her; but with the same result as his partner. At this time the lady was sinking daily, and becoming continually weaker. On the 18th of April Dr. Smethurst wrote a letter to Miss Louisa Bankes, which was marked "Private and confidential." It stated that her sister was very ill and desired to see her: she was to ask for Dr. and Mrs. Smethurst, and was "not to breathe a word of the contents of the note to any one." Miss Louisa Bankes was not at this time aware of the marriage ceremony that had been performed, and had her own views of her sister's conduct. She, however, on the following day went to Richmond, and found her sister in bed in a very feeble state. The deceased, when she saw her sister, made use of the expression, "Oh, don't say anything about it: it will be all right when I get well, won't it, dear?" turning to Dr. Smethurst, who said, "Yes, it will be all right soon;" and it was not likely that, under these circumstances, she would say anything disagreeable. Throughout the illness of the deceased Dr. Smethurst showed her every kindness and attention, and to her death she treated him with love and affection. But it was a remarkable circumstance that during the time Miss Bankes remained she was never for one moment left alone with her. While she was there the prisoner gave the deceased a saline draught, and she vomited immediately after it, and complained of its having a bad taste. Miss Bankes then offered to make

some tapioca, but the prisoner objected on the ground that there was no milk. Subsequently she offered to make some arrowroot, and to that also he objected, lest the landlady should not like it. She left that evening, and the next day wrote an affectionate letter to her sister, and received an answer from Dr. Smethurst containing this passage:—"After your departure, dear Bella had a very bad evening and night of it, purely from the excitement of seeing you and the fatigue consequent thereon. Vomiting and purging set in at a fearful rate, which of course prostrated her greatly. The doctor at once forbade any visitors for the present, or he would not be responsible for the effects attendant thereon." There was no doubt that after Miss Bankes left, Dr. Smethurst made such representations to Dr. Bird as induced him to say she had better not see visitors at present. On subsequent days she received other letters from Dr. Smethurst postponing her intended visits from time to time, describing her sister's condition, and mentioning that he had insisted on having a consultation between "Dr. Todd, the first physician of the day, and the two regular medical attendants, who are also the first doctors of the place." One of these letters was dated the 30th April, but made no mention of the extraordinary circumstance that on that day he had instructed a respectable attorney of Richmond to draw up a will upon a draft which he said had been prepared by a barrister in London, but which was in fact entirely in his own handwriting. On the following day

(Sunday) he called on the attorney, and, representing the case to be urgent on account of the lady's illness, induced him to go to Miss Bankes's lodgings, and the will was formally executed. By this document Miss Bankes left the whole of her property to Dr. Smethurst. Some remarkable circumstances attending this deed will appear in the evidence. The prisoner's statement that he had insisted upon a consultation between the Richmond doctors and Dr. Todd was quite correct. Dr. Todd did attend the lady; but after a short time came to the conclusion—at which Drs. Julius and Bird had already arrived—that the patient was suffering under unfair treatment. On the 29th Dr. Smethurst wrote that Dr. Todd not only acquiesced in what was being done, but recommended a perseverance in the treatment, with some slight additions of his own. This was not the fact; but the prisoner was not made aware of the suspicions entertained by the medical attendants. These caused the evacuations of the patient to be tested; and the result was so confirmatory of their views that they communicated with the police, and the prisoner was taken into custody. A great number of bottles containing drugs and medicine were taken possession of; and on Smethurst's person was found the following letter to his wife, sealed and stamped for the post:—

“Monday, May 2, 1859.

“MY DEAR MARY,—I have not been able to leave for town as I expected, in consequence of my medical aid being required in a case of illness. I shall, however, see you as soon as possible. Should anything unforeseen prevent my

leaving for town before the 11th, I will send you a check for Smith's money and extras. I will send 5*l*. I am quite well, and hope you are the same, and that I shall find you so when I see you, which I trust will not be long first. Present my kind regards to the Smiths and all old friends of the house. I heard from James the other day, and he said he had called on you, but that you had gone out for a walk. With best love, believe me,

“Yours affectionately,

“THOMAS SMETHURST.”

In the opinion of the Richmond magistrates, the case against the prisoner was not sufficiently strong to justify his committal, and he was discharged. On the following day, the 3rd May, Miss Bankes died; the circumstances which had already transpired rendered a coroner's inquest indispensable; and the result of the inquiry was, that the prisoner was committed to take his trial on a charge of wilful murder. Such being a brief narrative of the facts of the case, the learned Serjeant said, the case set up by the Crown was that death had been caused by the administration of small doses of some irritant poison, under the effects of which the system sunk, and death was the result, under the most painful and distressing circumstances. He believed it would be clearly established in the course of the case that the prisoner was a medical man, possessed of considerable skill in that profession, and that he was also a skilful chymist; and part of the case for the prosecution was, that he had availed himself of this knowledge to administer the poison to this unhappy lady in such a manner, and combined it with such other ingredients, as to cause it to be removed from the system and

to render its discovery in the body very difficult, if not almost impossible, by the ordinary tests that were employed for that purpose. One very material question for their consideration would be, in the first place, whether the death of the deceased was occasioned by poison, and, notwithstanding the difficulty to which he had adverted, he believed he should be able to establish that fact in the most conclusive manner. The next question then would be by whom was that poison administered; and it appeared to him that supposing the jury should be satisfied that the deceased died from poison, the only conclusion that they could come to upon the other evidence was, that the prisoner's must have been the hand that administered that poison. As motives to the commission of this act, the learned Serjeant pointed out that in addition to the important circumstance that the prisoner had procured the deceased to make a will, under which he would come into possession of the whole of her property, there was this very startling fact, that the prisoner had gone through the ceremony of marriage with the deceased lady, when he was aware that he was already married, and that his legal wife was living only a short distance off, and that it would have been impossible for him to have continued his connection with the deceased lady much longer without the discovery being made that he had been guilty of the crime of bigamy; and the jury would have to consider how far this fact might have operated as an inducement to the prisoner to make away with the deceased.

The counsel for the Crown having concluded his statement, proceeded to call the witnesses who were to support his case; but on the second day it was suddenly announced that one of the jurymen was very ill. The medical men in attendance as witnesses, and the official surgeon of Newgate, after some time had elapsed, certified that the unfortunate man was not in a condition to perform the duties of a jurymen, and probably would not be competent for some days; and the trial was adjourned to the first day of the next session.

On the 15th August the prisoner was again placed at the bar, and given in charge to another jury.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine stated the case for the Crown, which was of course substantially the same as that stated by him on the previous occasion.

The marriage of the prisoner with Isabella Bankes, on the 9th December, 1858, at Battersea, was proved. Also the marriage of the prisoner with Mary Durham at St. Mark's Church, Kennington, on the 28th March, 1828.

The landladies of the lodging-houses at Bayswater and Richmond deposed to having let their apartments to the prisoner and the deceased at the times stated.

Mrs. Robinson, the landlady of the house in Old Palace Gardens, said, that when the deceased first came to her house, she appeared to be quite well. She was taken ill about three weeks before she left, and Dr. Smethurst told witness it was a bilious attack. He said he was not quite satisfied with the way she was going on, and witness recommended him to obtain the as-

sistance of Mr. Julius, a medical gentleman of Richmond. The prisoner spoke to witness about having another medical man, and gave his card to hand to Dr. Julius. The prisoner and the deceased appeared to be on very kind and affectionate terms. Dr. Smethurst was particularly kind to the deceased. His object in calling in another medical man, he said, was, that he would not trust to himself any further, as he did not like the way in which his wife's illness was going on.

Mrs. Wheatly, — "I reside at 10, Alma-villas, Richmond. The prisoner and the deceased took possession of some apartments in my house on the 15th of April. Dr. Smethurst told me he should stay with me some time if Mrs. Smethurst got well. The prisoner engaged the apartments himself in the first instance, and he afterwards brought the deceased in a cab. She appeared to be very ill, and went to bed almost immediately. She only came down four times before her death. She was attended by Dr. Julius and Dr. Bird. I prepared her food. It consisted of arrow-root, tapioca, and rice. The prisoner always carried the food up himself, or received it from me at the door of the deceased's bedroom. No one but the prisoner administered either food or medicine to the deceased, and he used to bring the slops out of the room and place them on the landing for us to carry away. Upon one occasion I suggested to Dr. Julius that the deceased should have a nurse, and the prisoner said he could not afford it. I never on any occasion saw any remains of the food I prepared for the deceased; except once,

when the prisoner brought me some rice, and told me to throw it away, as it was sour."

Cross-examined.—Dr. Smethurst always appeared to me to be very kind and affectionate to the deceased. Upon one occasion I remember the prisoner requested me to preserve one of the evacuations of the deceased purposely for Dr. Julius to see it. On the 2nd of May, the day before the deceased died, the prisoner gave me a portion of an evacuation to show to Dr. Bird. Dr. Julius did not see the evacuation, on account of his being later than usual, and the prisoner told me it was not worth while to keep it, and I threw it away.

Miss Louisa Bankes, the sister of the deceased, was examined at some length. The principal points in her evidence related to the difficulty she had had in obtaining access to her sister, and that when permitted to see her, the prisoner was always in the room. The prisoner administered all food and medicine to her sister himself, and did not permit her to take anything that witness had prepared except on one occasion, but then he took the soup out of the room for the alleged purpose of thinning it. The deceased complained of her food frequently having a bitter taste, and invariably threw up what she had taken. On the first occasion when witness went to see her sister, she had some conversation about money matters, but prisoner did not say anything about her sister having made a will that morning. While there her sister complained of the taste of the tapioca, which was bitter, and asked her to make some; but witness did not do so because Dr.

Smethurst said the milk had not come. She afterwards offered to make some blanc-mange, but Dr. Smethurst would not allow her, as he said it would annoy the landlady. On the 21st April witness received a letter from Dr. Smethurst, in which he stated that the deceased had passed a very bad night, owing to the agitation into which she had been thrown by seeing her, and that the doctors forbade her seeing her for the present. When witness proposed to sit up with her sister all night, prisoner objected, and said he would rather attend upon her himself. Witness slept that night at a lodging close by, and on the following morning again applied to see her sister, and the prisoner said she was too ill. Prisoner got witness to go to London for some medicine, but when she returned refused to use it. Witness again requested to see her sister, and prisoner again said she was too ill. On the 30th April, in consequence of a letter from Dr. Smethurst, she went to Richmond again. While witness was in the house, some constables came and took prisoner into custody. He returned the same evening. Witness saw her sister while the prisoner was in custody. She was able to speak and understood perfectly what she said. Witness sat up with her all night, and gave her arrowroot and other food. She was not sick after taking any of the food witness gave her. When the prisoner came back from the police-court, witness asked him to put out some tea and other things for the nurse that had been sent by Dr. Julius. He refused, and said witness had taken the re-

sponsibility on herself and witness must pay the expense. Her sister appeared to rally during the night, but she sank on the following morning, and died about 11 o'clock.

Mr. Senior:—I am a solicitor at Richmond. The prisoner called at my office on Saturday, the 30th of April. He was a stranger to me at that time. He said he called to know if I could come up the Hill and make a will for a lady. I told him I would go immediately, and he replied, "No, not to-day; to-morrow. The lady was too ill that afternoon." I said I supposed he meant Monday, and he said "No," he meant to-morrow. I told him I did not like to do business on Sunday, and that the law did not like wills being executed on Sunday, but if it was an act of necessity I would do it. He showed me the paper produced, which was the draft of a will, and which he said had been drawn up by a barrister in London, and the lady wished to write it herself, but he thought it had better be done by a professional man. He called at my office on the Sunday morning, and said he must trouble me to come, as the lady had passed a very bad night. I told him I should like a medical man to be present, as the lady was so ill; and he said it was quite unnecessary, as the lady was only suffering from diarrhoea, and was quite right in her mind. I went to the prisoner's lodging, and he told me he thought it was right to inform me that although he was living with the lady they were not man and wife, and this was another reason why he did not wish a medical man to be present. I then went up to the

bedroom of the deceased, and the prisoner said to her, "My dear, this is the gentleman who has come to make your will." She bowed, and handed me the paper I had seen on the previous Saturday. I looked at the paper and asked if that was what she wished, and read it to her, and she said it was quite correct, except that she wished to leave a brooch to a friend. I then drew up the will in accordance with her instructions in the lower room. The prisoner was with me, and when the will had been drawn up the prisoner said that the daughter of the landlady might be one of the witnesses, and he said he supposed I could say it was some Chancery paper. I told him that it would not do, she must know it was a will, and he replied, "Oh, very well." Shortly afterwards the deceased executed the will, and I and Miss Wheatly attested it, and I then handed the document to the deceased, and went down stairs accompanied by the prisoner, and he paid me my fee.

The will was then put in and read. It was to the effect that the whole of the property of the deceased lady, with the exception of a brooch set in pearls and brilliants, was devised, to the prisoner, who was also constituted sole executor. The lady was described in the instrument as a "spinster," and the prisoner was described as her "sincere and beloved friend."

Cross-examined.—I read the will over slowly to the deceased, and she appeared to be quite aware of the effect of it, and to be perfectly competent to execute such an instrument.

Miss Louisa Bankes recalled.—

Nothing was said to me on the Sunday about my sister having made her will.

Dr. Julius said, that on the 3rd of April he was called in to see the deceased, who was represented to be suffering from violent diarrhœa and vomiting. The prisoner said he believed her liver was overloaded with bile. Witness prescribed accordingly, but without any abatement of the symptoms. There was no appearance of bile in the evacuations after the third or fourth day that he saw her, yet the symptoms of diarrhœa and vomiting continued, with a burning sensation in the bowels and soreness of the mouth. She complained of parching throat, and of a burning sensation in her mouth. Witness could not account for any of these appearances by any natural disease, and began to entertain an opinion that something of an irritant character was being administered to the deceased, and in consequence desired that his partner, Dr. Bird, should also see the patient. He did not communicate his suspicions to Dr. Bird, who taking the prisoner's account of the disease, and knowing Dr. Julius' prescriptions, adopted his mode of treatment, but with the same want of success; the medicines were varied, but the symptoms continued; on this Dr. Julius communicated to him his fears, and Dr. Bird, on further observation, agreed in his conclusion that the patient was suffering from some irritant, of the administration of which they knew nothing. During this period the prisoner always saw the medical attendants, was always present in the room when they were with the

patient, and recommended or dissuaded the administration of various medicines. He displayed a considerable knowledge of medicine. On the 28th of April, the patient was very ill, and repeatedly said to Dr. Bird, in the prisoner's presence, that she should like some one else to be called in. On the same day, the prisoner (who had always exhibited a desire that the best medical advice should be obtained) suggested that Dr. Todd should be called in. On Dr. Todd's arrival, Dr. Julius gave him an outline of the case and treatment, but did not say anything of the suspicions that had arisen in his mind. Subsequent to Dr. Todd's attendance, Dr. Julius procured some of the evacuations, and in consequence of the examination and further observation, thought it his duty to communicate with the magistrates, and the prisoner was taken into custody, but was released on his own recognizances. Dr. Julius was unable to ascribe the symptoms to any natural cause, but if small doses of some irritant poison were administered from time to time, it would have accounted for all the appearances that exhibited themselves. Antimony and arsenic would be the character of poisons likely to produce such results. Neither antimony nor arsenic were in any of the medicines he prescribed for the deceased. The prisoner informed him that the deceased was not in the family way.

Dr. Bird, after confirming the general evidence of Dr. Julius, said that having served on the staff of Omar Pasha, during the Crimean war, he had had extensive opportunity of studying bowel

complaints. None of the symptoms exhibited by the deceased were, in his judgment, reconcilable with any known disease. In his opinion, the administration of antimony or arsenic in small doses would have accounted for all these symptoms. The prisoner told him, on one occasion, that the deceased had seen her sister, and that it had very much excited her; and witness then told him that it would be better for her not to come again.

Cross-examined.—He gave an ample quantity of every ingredient to afford sufficient opportunity for analyzation.

Mr. Barwell, a surgeon, who made a *post-mortem* examination of the body of the deceased, stated that he found that she was from five to seven weeks advanced in pregnancy, and described the various appearances presented by the intestines. Mr. Barwell said that the symptoms described were not reconcilable with any disease within his experience, but quite reconcilable with the fact of some irritant having been frequently administered during life.

Dr. Wilkes, a physician, and Demonstrator of Anatomy at Guy's Hospital, said that, excluding dysentery, he was not acquainted with any form of disease that would produce similar symptoms. Severe dysentery would produce great inflammation of the intestines, and also ulceration.

Dr. Todd said he was Physician to King's College Hospital, and had been in practice a great many years. Dr. Julius told him the nature of the case before he saw the deceased; but he did not tell him his suspicions that irritants were being administered to her. When he saw the deceased he

noticed a peculiar expression of countenance—an expression of terror, as though she was under the influence of some one; and that was not in accordance with the appearance of a patient suffering from an ordinary disease. The abdomen was very hard, which was an indication of the existence of extensive inflammation in the stomach, and he was at once under the impression that she was suffering from the influence of some irritant poison. By witness's desire an evacuation was obtained, and he directed Dr. Julius to make up the sulphate of copper and opium pills, with a view to allay the irritation. Witness had never known any bad effect produced by this medicine, and he did not think it possible it could produce a burning sensation in the throat or the stomach. If the disease had been diarrhœa and bowel complaint, the medicines administered by Dr. Julius were the proper ones to be administered in such a case.

Serjeant Ballantine.—From all you have heard of this case, what in your opinion was the cause of this lady's death?

Dr. Todd.—I believe that her death was occasioned by the administration of some irritant poison, such as arsenic, antimony, or corrosive sublimate.

By Serjeant Ballantine.—The only natural disease that could in any way account for the symptoms of the deceased would be what is called acute dysentery.

Evidence was then given that during the month of April the prisoner had about 100*l.* or 150*l.* to his credit in the London and Westminster Bank, where he kept an account. On the 16th of April a sum of 71*l.* 5*s.*, the amount of

the dividend of the deceased, was paid in to his credit.

Mr. Buzzard, being recalled, said he was present when Dr. Taylor began to analyze a portion of the contents of the bottle. He did so by what was called Reintsch's test, and Dr. Taylor showed him some crystals of arsenious acid, and the copper that was used for the test was coated with a dark gray substance. Upon these discoveries being made, witness at once proceeded to Richmond, and made a communication to Dr. Julius and Dr. Bird. In cases of pregnancy there was sometimes very violent purging and sickness.

Dr. Bowerbank and Dr. Copland, who had had extensive experience of acute dysentery in tropical countries, gave it as their distinct opinion that the symptoms of the deceased were not reconcilable with that disease, but were those of the presence of irritant poison.

Dr. Alfred Swaine Taylor said, I am Professor of Chemistry at Guy's Hospital, and a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and I have had great experience in cases of this description. On Sunday, the 1st of May, Mr. Buzzard called on me, and brought two bottles, which he said contained matters he wished me to examine. I took about two drachms from one of these bottles, and having first examined the test and the vessel to be employed, and ascertained that they were pure, I then made the test, and discovered a metallic deposit upon the copper wire, which, in my opinion, indicated the presence of arsenic or antimony, but I could not speak to the exact description of substance. I was

told that it was necessary to do something to save the life of this lady, and, therefore, contrary to my custom of not making analyses on a Sunday, I proceeded with my experiment by boiling copper gauze in the liquid, and upon examining it afterwards with a microscope, I saw appearances closely resembling metallic arsenic, and I treated the metal and obtained crystals of arsenic. (Dr. Taylor produced the wire gauze with the crystals upon it.) I subsequently applied nitric acid to these crystals, and the result satisfied me that they were composed of arsenic. I then finished the examination of the contents of the bottle No. 2, and the result perfectly satisfied me that I was correct in discovering the presence of arsenic. My calculation was, that there must have been less than a quarter of a grain mixed with the four ounces of matter that were in the bottle No. 2. There was no trace of mercury, or antimony, or bismuth, but I did discover the presence of copper by a subsequent test. I examined the evacuation, and came to the conclusion that it was such an one as would pass from a person who had taken arsenic, and I immediately recommended that the antidote for arsenic, hydrate of magnesia, should be administered to the patient. I afterwards examined the contents of the other bottle, and found that it did not contain any poison or any metallic matter whatever. On the 5th and 7th of May, Inspector M'Intyre brought me a portion of the viscera of a human being, which I subsequently submitted to a chymical examination. The officer also gave me a number of

bottles, and several pill-boxes, which I numbered. There were altogether twenty-eight articles given me, and I examined the whole of them for arsenic and other poisons, but I did not discover any. (Dr. Taylor then described the condition and appearances presented by the intestines, and said that he discovered the presence of antimony in the lower intestines, and also in the cœcum, and upon one of the kidneys. There were also traces of antimony in some blood that was said to have been taken from the heart of the deceased.) I next examined the medicines that had been supplied by Dr. Julius, and found that they contained the ingredients of which they were represented to be composed. I examined another bottle, No. 21, which appeared to contain a clear watery liquid of a saline taste, and I tested a portion of the contents by Reintsch's test, and upon first trying the copper, it was entirely consumed. I made a further test, which led me to suppose that there was arsenic present in the solution; but it turned out that I was mistaken, and that it did not contain either arsenic or antimony, and that the arsenical appearances originally produced came from the copper gauze. Chlorate of potass is a cooling mixture.

By the Court.—By the destruction of the copper, the arsenic contained in it was set free, and this destroyed the effect of the experiment.

Dr. Taylor concluded by stating that from the symptoms exhibited by the deceased, and the manner she was treated, he could ascribe the death to no other cause than the administration of some irri-

tant poison. The quantity of arsenic that I discovered I should say was less than half a grain. I discovered the presence of arsenic by using copper gauze of the same description that I used afterwards to the contents of the bottle No. 21. In the experiment I made with this bottle, the arsenic was deposited by myself. Dr. Odling also came to the conclusion that the bottle contained arsenic, and we both stated that fact in our examination before the magistrates and the coroner, and we were, of course, both mistaken. We believed, no doubt, at the time that the arsenic we found was contained in the liquid. I have used the same description of copper gauze for a great many years, and never before discovered the presence of arsenic in it. I shall certainly continue to use it, but I shall take care not to do so with chlorate of potass.

Serjeant Parry here asked for the deposition of Dr. Taylor taken before the magistrates, and a portion of it was read. It was to the effect that he had discovered the presence of arsenic in the bottle No. 21, in which there was chlorate of potass, and that the latter was a harmless saline mixture, acting upon the kidneys, and that if poison had been administered in it, its effect would probably be to carry off the noxious ingredient from the body very quickly, but that by the repetition constantly of such a proceeding, chronic inflammation of the intestines would be created, which would yield to no treatment, and would end in the death of the patient from exhaustion.

Dr. Taylor continued:—At the time I gave this evidence,

I firmly believed that arsenic was contained in the mixture, and that it had not come there from my test, but had been placed there by some one. When I was examined before the coroner, I expressed my opinion to be that the death was more referable to antimony than to arsenic. The finding of the arsenic in the bottle did not have any effect upon the opinion. I subsequently formed in reference to the case. The moment I discovered the mistake that had been made, I gave the information to Serjeant Ballantine. No arsenic was found in the body of the deceased. I did not form my theory, to account for the absence of arsenic from the tissues of the body, in consequence of finding, as I supposed, the arsenic in the chlorate of potass. After Dr. Odling and myself had given our evidence relative to finding the arsenic in the bottle, we thought it was possible there might be some mistake, and we made other experiments to satisfy ourselves. We made seventy-seven experiments with the same copper gauze, and in seventy-six of them no arsenic was discovered, and the only instance in which it was found was in the evacuation.

Dr. Odling, the Professor of Practical Chymistry at Guy's Hospital, agreed in the statement of Dr. Taylor, and said he was satisfied that there was antimony in the body. And added—I agree with the other witnesses that the death of the deceased arose from the administration of some irritant poison, and I do not know of any disease that would account for the symptoms that have been spoken to.

In addition to the eminent medical men who had attended the deceased during her illness, or who had examined her remains after death, the counsel for the Crown called a number of scientific men of the highest standing, who were unanimous in stating, after having heard the testimony of these witnesses, that they could not refer the symptoms described to any natural cause, but could only refer them to the continuous administration of some irritant poison, such as antimony or arsenic, in small doses; by which the action of the medicines prescribed was counteracted, and which were the cause of death.

This was the case for the Crown.

Mr. Serjeant Parry addressed the jury on behalf of the prisoner in a speech of great length, observing that after having undergone the agony of a double trial, and enduring for a long period the accumulation of prejudice that had been cast upon him, the unfortunate gentleman at the bar had at last the opportunity of laying before a jury of his country the defence he had to offer upon this most serious charge. What was the charge against the prisoner? It was that he had inveigled the unhappy lady into his power, and that he had basely and cruelly murdered her for the sake of her property. What was the evidence upon which they were called upon to say that the prisoner was guilty of this most fearful crime? He need not remind them that it was the duty of the prosecution in such a case as this to make out the charge without the possibility of doubt.

VOL. CI.

A *prima facie* case was not sufficient. The prosecution was bound to satisfy the jury that the prisoner was guilty of the crime, and if they failed in any one particular, if any single link was wanting, the prisoner was by the law of England entitled to the benefit of that doubt, and they were bound to acquit him. His learned friend, in detailing the particulars of this almost unparalleled case, had undertaken to satisfy them that the deceased lady died of poison, and that that poison was administered by the hand of the unfortunate gentleman at the bar—unfortunate, if he were guilty, doubly unfortunate indeed if he were innocent. He accepted these propositions of his learned friend, and he should endeavour to show that he had failed in making out either of them, and that they were not called upon to convict the prisoner of the fearful crime laid to his charge. In the first place, as to the conduct of the prisoner, he could not deny that he had violated the moral law, and, perhaps, even a higher one; that he was married in 1828 to a woman much older than himself, and that subsequently, forgetting his duty to her and his duty to society,—perhaps actuated by passion or affection,—he had contracted a marriage with this lady. Dr. Smethurst must himself agree with him that there could be no palliation for this conduct; but, at the same time, it was clear that no deception had been practised upon the deceased, and that she was perfectly well aware of the fact; and that they both left Rifle-terrace with the intention of living together as man and wife, and that the lady her-

A A

self was perfectly aware of the illegality of their connection. This fact, it appeared to him, offered an explanation of a great many of the circumstances that had been detailed in the course of the case. The learned Serjeant then referred to the allegations of the prosecution that the prisoner had evidently contemplated that his connection with Miss Bankes should be temporary, that he had kept her entirely under his own control, that he had refused to employ a nurse on the ground that he could not afford it; all of which he said had not been substantiated by the evidence—some of it, indeed, had been disproved; and then said he believed that the will that had been made by the deceased was the entire foundation for this charge, and that no charge would have been made against Dr. Smethurst if this will had not been executed. It might be said that this supplied the motive: but if the other evidence was insufficient to support the charge that the prisoner had wilfully destroyed the life of this lady, it appeared to him that the existence of the will ought not to be allowed to operate in any way upon their judgment. Supposing, however, that the will was to be taken as evidence of a motive, what was that motive? It was said that he had perpetrated this crime to obtain possession of about £1700 or £1800; but he would equally have come into possession of it if the deceased had lived; for it was clear she was deeply attached to him, and that she had handed over to him the dividend that she received in April. While she lived, also, she was entitled to a life interest in

£5000, and the prisoner would have had the benefit of that also; and therefore he had a much stronger motive for her to live than he had to destroy her. Again, could there be any doubt that the will was the act of the deceased as much as it was that of the prisoner, and just as much as the marriage was her act as much as it was his? These, he believed, were the principal points relied upon by the prosecution to show that the prisoner's was the hand by which the crime was committed, and he would ask them confidently whether they could at the utmost be taken to amount to more than suspicion? He was certain they would not forget the uniform kindness and affection with which he had been proved to have treated the deceased; and, although it was suggested on the part of the prosecution that this conduct was merely practised to deceive and to throw off suspicion, he was sure the jury would pause before they attributed such diabolical conduct to any human being, unless upon the very strongest evidence. The suggestion on the part of the prosecution was that the prisoner was poisoning this lady; but yet there could be no doubt that he was the first to propose that additional medical assistance should be called in, and everything he did must have been done under the very eyes of several medical men of the greatest skill and experience. He would now call their attention to the evidence by which it was sought to make out that a crime had in point of fact been committed; and it appeared to him that the evidence, as it was called, was nothing but

a theory set up by scientific men from beginning to end, and that there were no facts upon which the jury, in a case of life and death, would be justified in coming to the conclusion that a crime had been committed. It was said that the death arose from the administration of some irritant poison, such as arsenic or antimony. In the first place, had any arsenic or antimony, or any other poison, been shown to have been, either indirectly or directly, in the possession of the prisoner, or that he had had anything to do with any poison, or to have had any poison within his reach or under his control? As to the stupid theory that the poison had been carried off by means of the chlorate of potass, it would be exploded long before the conclusion of the trial, if it were not already, and that it was merely the offspring of a fertile brain, to account for what was felt to be an almost overwhelming difficulty in the way of the prosecution, namely, the absence of any poison in the body of the deceased. He would ask his learned friend, and he would also ask the jury, whether they had ever heard of a conviction for murder by poison without some evidence being adduced that the prisoner had poison in his possession, or that he was in a condition to obtain it? and upon the absence of this evidence alone, it appeared to him that they would be justified in acquitting the prisoner. The learned Serjeant then referred to the evidence of Dr. Taylor, and reminded the jury that when he was examined originally he stated distinctly and positively, and without the least reservation,

that he had discovered arsenic in a vessel that was in the possession and control of the prisoner. If this had been the fact it would have been almost conclusive evidence against the prisoner; and if the mistake had never been found out, upon that fact alone the prisoner would have gone to the scaffold perfectly innocent probably of the crime for which his life was sacrificed. He could not avoid saying that it was almost a miraculous interposition that the blunder should have been discovered. Would they not pause before they gave effect to the medical testimony after this extraordinary fact? Dr. Taylor, [no doubt, believed that he was right; but was it not clear that he was wrong? and the question then was, what reliance ought to be placed upon evidence of this description in a case where the life of a fellow-creature was at stake? The same test was applied to the evacuation that was applied to the chlorate of potass, and how were they to tell whether there had not been some mistake with one as with the other? and he called upon them to dismiss altogether the evidence of Dr. Taylor from their consideration, in this particular instance. It was already in evidence that the common "grey powder" frequently contained antimony, and bismuth arsenic. Dr. Taylor himself admitted that in the sulphate of copper which came from the surgery of Dr. Julius he had discovered traces of arsenic. The learned Serjeant then stated the nature of the medical evidence he proposed to lay before the jury, and said he should be able to show them, not only that the deceased lady did

A A 2

not die of poison, but that she died from natural causes.

As it is impossible to give an abstract of the scientific evidence, it must suffice to give the effect of the testimony. Dr. Richardson, Mr. Rogers, and Dr. Webb, professors at the St. George's or Grosvenor School of Medicine, were decidedly of opinion that the symptoms of the deceased were not reconcilable with a case of slow arsenical poisoning. Bismuth, as sold in the shops, almost always contained arsenic. They thought that had death in this case been produced by slow arsenical or antimonial poisoning, the poison would have been found. They were of opinion that the deceased died of acute dysentery. The two former gentlemen had been witnesses on Palmer's trial, and gave evidence in favour of the accused. They were of opinion that Cooke did not die of strychnine; and that if strychnine had been administered it could have been detected. Dr. Webb was of opinion that the pregnancy of the deceased was a material ingredient in the case, and would have accounted for many of the symptoms that presented themselves.

Dr. Thudicombe, M.D., and lecturer on practical and experimental chymistry, and a pupil of Professor Liebig, gave his opinion that the symptoms described were consistent with the deceased having died a natural death, and in his opinion she died of diphtheretic dysentery. The symptoms were not consistent with death from slow arsenical or antimonial poisoning. He was also of opinion that in any case of poisoning of this description the poison would be

found in the tissues of the body. Had analysed "grey powder" and bismuth, and found traces of arsenic and antimony in both.

Dr. Girdwood, Mr. Edwards, and Dr. Tyler Smith, gentlemen of extensive experience in cases of pregnancy and the diseases of women, stated that the early stages of pregnancy were frequently accompanied by purging, vomiting, and burning sensations. The symptoms in this case were not inconsistent with their observations in other cases. They thought the death of the deceased was occasioned by exhaustion produced by continued purging and sickness, induced by irritation of the bowels from natural causes. Dr. Smith said that in cases of pregnancy accompanied by purging and vomiting it was very common for the patient to feel a burning sensation in the stomach, and the mouth would become sore; and he had seen cases where the symptoms had been so similar to those which would have resulted from the administration of poison, that the evacuations of the patient had been submitted to a chymist.

Serjeant Ballantine, in his reply upon the case, referred in particular to the fact that the prisoner had falsely stated that the deceased was not in the family-way, when he must have known that she was; and this fact rendered it more important that the deceased should be got out of the way. He said that the direct evidence of the able practitioners who had seen the patient during life, and tested the condition of her corpse, must put aside the theories of scientific men who knew nothing of the case but by

hearsay. Then, with regard to the will, he would ask them why the prisoner should have induced this unhappy lady to make a will, by which she bequeathed him all the property she possessed in the world, when, supposing she was only suffering from a bowel complaint, there was no reason to suppose that her death was imminent, and whether that proceeding could be reconciled with any other supposition than that the prisoner knew perfectly well that the result would be fatal? Could they go into the details of that sick chamber—could they reflect that the prisoner had performed all the painful offices that must be required during a period of three weeks, when he had plenty of money to employ nurses and proper persons to attend upon the deceased, without asking themselves at the same time could the prisoner have acted in this manner if he had not some extraordinary object in view? The error made by Dr. Taylor in one analysis was one which might have been made by any other chymist under the same circumstances, and reflected no discredit on his testimony. It was made no part of the present case; for it had not only been communicated to the prisoner as soon as discovered, but he had himself stated it to the jury in his opening. It had been distinctly proved that the bismuth and grey powder which came from Dr. Julius's surgery did not contain arsenic or antimony, but were pure.

The Chief Baron then summed up; but as his lordship's address occupied nearly two days—eight hours and a half—it is impossible to do more than indicate the points on which he touched. He

said that the first material question the jury would have to consider was whether it was made out to their satisfaction that the deceased lady came to her death by poison; and then came the more important question, so far as the prisoner was concerned—was it proved by reasonable evidence that it was by his hand that poison was administered? As to the marriage of the prisoner and the deceased—though in itself a breach of the law and a felony—the jury ought not to allow it to have any weight, excepting so far as it operated with the other facts in the case upon the question whether the prisoner was guilty or innocent of the more serious crime laid to his charge. It appeared to him that it was a most important subject for their consideration, the position of the deceased at the time the fatal event occurred, and also what she believed to be her own position with regard to the prisoner. In the letter she wrote to her sister she stated that she was happy, and she also told her sister when she first saw her during her illness, that when she got well it would be all right. What did she mean by that expression, and what would have become of the prisoner if she had got well, he having a wife living? In the will that had been made by the deceased she appeared to have been studiously called “spinster,” and she signed it in her maiden name of Isabella Bankes, and how she could have done this knowing that she had gone through the ceremony of marriage with the prisoner, and might therefore naturally have supposed herself entitled to the name of Smethurst, was certainly a very myste-

rious and extraordinary circumstance. He could not help also observing upon the circumstances under which that will was made. The prisoner had certainly told a falsehood to Mr. Senior, the attorney, and he did not appear to scruple to state what must have tended to degrade most seriously this unhappy lady for the purpose of having the will prepared in the form he required. If he had told the attorney the truth, and said that he had gone through the ceremony of marriage with the lady, he would never have drawn up the will in the form in which it appeared. Another portion of the prisoner's conduct at this time was certainly matter for very serious consideration. At the very period when this unhappy woman was lying in agony and misery on her death-bed, and when, according to the prisoner's own statement, she was in such a condition as not to be able to bear the excitement of seeing her own sister, he took into her bedroom, on a Sunday, an entire stranger, an attorney, and there a will prepared by himself was read over to the unhappy woman, who executed it under the circumstances of degradation to which he had alluded. He could not contemplate this scene of suffering and privation, when this poor dying creature had all her relatives excluded from her, and an attorney was thrust into her presence, and she was allowed to pass into the other world without one word of religious consolation, as if she had been a beggar and an unbeliever in a heathen land.—The learned counsel for the prisoner had endeavoured to show that he had no pecuniary motive for the death of the deceased, in-

asmuch as he would be entitled to receive the interest on the 5000*l.*—150*l.* a year—during her lifetime; but, on the other hand, it should not be forgotten that if the will of the deceased were acted upon he would at once come into possession of 1700*l.* or 1800*l.*, which would have amounted to twelve years' purchase of the dividend. The illness of the deceased appeared to have commenced very soon after the parties arrived at Richmond; the prisoner appeared to have described it as a bilious attack; he undoubtedly appeared desirous to have additional medical aid, and Dr. Julius was called in, in consequence. In both the lodgings at Richmond the prisoner appeared to have performed all the offices that were necessary in connection with the patient, although it was perfectly clear that he had ample means to provide proper attendants for the deceased. The jury would consider what bearing this had upon the case. Did he refuse to have a nurse because he did not wish to have a witness in that bed-room? Was this the prisoner's object? He not only refused to have a nurse, but he also wrote to the sister to prevent her from visiting her sister. The reason the prisoner gave for not having a nurse was, that he could not afford it, when at this very time the deceased lady had an income of 220*l.* a-year, and surely some portion of that might have been expended upon her comfort. It also appeared that no portion of any of the food that was administered to the deceased was ever allowed to remain; it was always thrown away, so that no person ever had an opportunity of tasting it. This was one of

the facts in the case, and the jury would draw their own inference from it. It was a fact in favour of the prisoner that neither arsenic nor antimony was found at the prisoner's lodging nor on his person. After the first interview, the prisoner had taken every means in his power to prevent the deceased seeing her sister, upon the ground that the doctors forbade it; which was not the truth. Why was not the sister informed on the 30th of April, when she was allowed to see the deceased again, that she had made her will on that morning? and what could have been the object of the prisoner in wishing that the young woman who was a witness to the will should be told that it was some Chancery paper, and not that it was a will? This deception would have been practised upon her if the straightforward attorney had not insisted upon her being told what she was signing. These it appeared to him were very material facts in the inquiry. His lordship then observed upon the fact of Miss Louisa Bankes being sent away on the day before the death occurred, and said that this fact very probably was more in connection with the will that had just before been executed, and from a fear that the deceased might at the last moment revoke it in favour of a beloved sister, than with the actual death of the deceased, but still it was a fact in the case, and it must be taken into their consideration: he then referred to the fact that, after the prisoner ceased to attend upon the deceased she did not vomit when food was given to her; and that the prisoner said that the par-

ties about the deceased had taken the responsibility, and he should not give out anything or pay anything, although at this time he had a considerable amount of the deceased's own money at his banker's. He next called the attention of the jury to the fact that the draft of the will was all in the handwriting of the prisoner, and that there was no evidence that it had been drawn up by a barrister, as the prisoner had represented. His lordship then proceeded to comment upon the medical evidence. In reference to the point urged in favour of the prisoner that no poison had been found in his possession, his lordship pointed out that the prisoner had had ample opportunity, between his discharge on Monday evening and his re-arrest the following day, of getting rid of any poison he might have had; and if the jury thought the deceased really died of poison, the fact that no poison had been found in the prisoner's possession was not of much weight. The medical witnesses called for the defence thought the symptoms of this case inconsistent with slow arsenical poisoning, and that had arsenic or antimony been the cause of death, some portions of those substances would have been found in the body. These statements were, however, the opinions of scientific men, the result of reading and study, and the jury would have to consider how far it weighed against the evidence of those scientific witnesses who had seen the patient while living, and had observed personally all the symptoms that manifested themselves. The medical men first called in found themselves baffled by the

disease; the medicines not only did not alleviate the symptoms; but did not produce even their natural effects; they therefore came to the conclusion that something was being administered which counteracted their medicines. Dr. Todd, one of the most eminent physicians of our time, was called in, and he, too, came to the same conclusion. These gentlemen, and other competent witnesses who had not seen the patient while living, were equally of opinion that the symptoms were not ascribable to any natural causes, but were those which would arise from the continuous administration of an irritant poison. The counsel for the prisoner had laid much stress upon the mistake made by Dr. Taylor in one of his tests, and asked them to dismiss Dr. Taylor's evidence entirely from their consideration. His lordship did not agree in this. The failure of Dr. Taylor's analysis in one instance arose from a new and hitherto unknown fact in science, and did not in any way invalidate his testimony. It appeared to him that no answer whatever had been given to the main point urged by the prosecution, that no medicine whatever had the slightest effect upon the malady under which the deceased was suffering. He did not agree with the learned counsel for the prisoner that the real question for the jury was to consider which set of medical witnesses were entitled to credit. The medical evidence was, of course, very important, but the jury must, in addition, look at all the other facts in the case, and particularly to the conduct of the prisoner, and his motives for committing the crime. They

must, after all, be guided by those rules of common sense that would operate upon the minds of reasonable men with regard to the more important actions of their lives, and even supposing that there were no medical testimony at all in the case, they would still have, as it appeared to him, a very grave question to decide with reference to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner.

The jury, after a deliberation of twenty minutes, found a verdict of *Guilty*.

When asked, in the usual form, whether he had anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon him, the prisoner, who appeared thunderstruck at the verdict, but speedily recovered his self-possession, addressed the Court at considerable length. His address, which, though rambling, had much more power than could have been expected under the circumstances, attempted to explain some circumstances in his conduct, and concluded with strong assertions of his innocence, and denunciation of Dr. Julius, against whom he appeared to entertain a particular animosity.

The learned Judge, expressing his concurrence in the finding of the jury, passed sentence of death in the usual form.

The prisoner heard the sentence without exhibiting the least emotion, and when the Lord Chief Baron had concluded, he exclaimed, in a firm voice, "I declare Dr. Julius to be my murderer. I declare I am innocent before God."

According to the custom of England, the public, who, before the trial, had universally believed

the guilt of the accused, no sooner saw him found guilty by the proper tribunal, than they began to discover his innocence. It is the nature of crimes such as that alleged in this case to be, in most instances, incapable of demonstrative proof; and it appeared from the medical evidence for the defence, given on the trials of Palmer and Smethurst, that there are individuals and schools of some eminence who controvert the opinions of the received authorities. The legal profession, also, can in no way be accused of mute subservience to professional authority, and are wont to exercise their acuteness in criticisms on all cases of importance or novelty that may arise. It is, beyond question, of great advantage to society that this should be so; for the strong conflict of opinion in the one profession would not permit the dicta of the opposite sect to be taken without investigation; and the experience of the other in the laws of evidence are equally adapted to prevent illogical deductions from scientific facts, and to provide a just application of the extrinsic circumstances to the medical testimony. By the two professions the case of Smethurst was taken up with extraordinary eagerness, and the daily newspapers were filled with letters from the one side and the other. It was the opinion of many that in this controversy the two professions dealt too exclusively each with its own domain—that the doctors discussed too exclusively the medical facts and theories, and that the lawyers confined themselves too much to the collateral facts, without embracing the medical facts. This circumstance

was of much use to the prisoner; for while it is quite possible that neither of two classes of evidence, if considered separately, may afford sufficient proof, the two combined may be irresistible. However this may be, the controversy prepared the public mind to believe that Smethurst had not been proved—legally proved—guilty of the crime of which he had been convicted, and, therefore, when the Home Secretary sent a reprieve, it was felt that the case was undergoing a deliberate revision. The question of life and death hung in suspense until the middle of November, when the Home Secretary announced his decision by the following letter:—

“Whitehall, Nov. 15, 1859.

“MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's further report, of the 18th ult., on the case of Thomas Smethurst, who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court, in August last, of murder, and sentenced to death.

“As your Lordship suggests in that report that reference should be made to the judgment of medical and scientific persons selected by the Secretary of State, for the purpose of considering the symptoms and appearances of the deceased Isabella Bankes, and the result of the analysis, I have sent the evidence, your Lordship's reports, and all the papers bearing upon the medical points of the case, to Sir Benjamin Brodie, from whom I have received a letter, of which I enclose you a copy, and who is of opinion that, although the facts are full of suspicion against Smethurst, there is not absolute and complete evidence of his guilt.

“After a very careful and anxious consideration of all the facts of this very peculiar case, I have come to the conclusion that there is sufficient doubt of the prisoner's guilt to render it my duty to advise the grant to him of a free pardon, which will be restricted to the particular offence of which he stands convicted, it

being my intention to institute a prosecution against him for bigamy.

"The necessity which I have felt for advising Her Majesty to grant a free pardon in this case has not, as it appears to me, arisen from any defect in the constitution or proceedings of our criminal tribunals. It has arisen from the imperfection of medical science, and from the fallibility of judgment, in an obscure malady, even of skilful and experienced medical practitioners.

"I have, &c.,

"G. C. LEWIS."

"The Lord Chief Baron, &c."

The "Richmond Poisoning Case," from its strange disclosures of private life, the first imperfect trial, the protracted proceedings of the second, the uncertainty of the medical science then revealed, the strong controversy that followed, and the reversal of the solemn conclusion of the jury, had already deserved a place among the most remarkable criminal trials; the singular nature of the defence set up when Smethurst was placed at the bar on a charge of bigamy, in having feloniously married Isabella Bankes, his first wife being then living, completed its claim to notoriety. When Smethurst was put on his trial on the charge of murdering Isabella Bankes, it was universally known that, although recently married to the deceased lady, he had another wife living, and with whom he was actually cohabiting at the time he formed the acquaintance with the deceased; and, indeed, that Miss Bankes must have gone through the marriage ceremony with the perfect knowledge that it was an illegal proceeding, and altogether void. Such, however, was the magnitude of the charge on which he was then arraigned, that his double marriage almost escaped remark as a deep crime;

and, therefore, when he was placed at the bar to answer for his felonious second marriage, it took the public somewhat by surprise, although not only a justifiable, but a necessary, consequence of the pardon extended to him on his previous conviction. The defence of Smethurst to the indictment for bigamy was, that his first wife was the bigamist; that at the time she was married to him she was already the wife of another man, who was then living. The consequence would be that his first marriage was a nullity, his marriage with Isabella Bankes valid; and, therefore, that he had committed no crime. The case, as elicited on the trial, was truly extraordinary. It was alleged that at the time of Smethurst's marriage with his first wife, Mary Durham, that lady was already married to a Mr. Johnson; that they kept a regular establishment, that she passed as, and was reputed to be, his wife; and that she had one son by him. A little further inquiry, however, elicited the fact that Mr. Johnson was no more entitled to that name than Mary Durham was to be entitled Mrs. Johnson. In fact the gentleman's real name was Laporte; he was married to a lady with whom he lived in good style, by whom he had a family, and who was visited by his and her relatives. Mary Durham was, in fact, his kept mistress. The only visitor to Mr. and Mrs. Johnson was the accused Smethurst. It is probable, indeed, that, following the course usual in such irregular connections, when Mr. Laporte became tired of his mistress, he got rid of her by marrying her to

Smethurst; but he took to his proper home the son he had had by her, and gave him a good education. This person, now fifty-two years of age, was one of the witnesses produced. No attempt was made to prove any marriage between Mr. and Mrs. Johnson; neither—and it seems a singular circumstance—did the counsel for the Crown offer proof of the marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Laporte. Taking advantage of this omission, the prisoner's counsel urged the jury to the conclusion that it was quite as probable that Mary Durham was the lawful wife, as the lady calling herself Mrs. Laporte, and, therefore, to acquit the prisoner. The jury, however, without hesitation, pronounced him guilty of the bigamy.

A very anxious task now devolved on Baron Bramwell—that of pronouncing a just sentence on the prisoner—a sentence that should neither fall short of the prisoner's deserts, nor exceed the moral turpitude of his offence. The present charge had originated in an accusation of a much deeper nature, of which he had been convicted; but the royal pardon had obliterated all the previous proceedings. It was impossible to discharge from the moral sense the terrible scenes which the trial for murder had disclosed; but they made no part of the present proceedings. Smethurst had not deserved any lighter sentence by his previous sufferings, which could not reasonably be taken into consideration; neither, on the other hand, had he merited any aggravation of punishment by the suspicion which he had incurred on other

charges. Baron Bramwell having consulted Mr. Justice Byles, said, that the offence of bigamy varied very much in its circumstances. When it was committed by two abandoned persons who knew perfectly well what they were doing, it was comparatively venial to the case where a man deserted a virtuous and respectable wife, and married another woman equally virtuous and respectable, for the purpose of obtaining possession of her person or property. In this case Smethurst could scarcely be said to have deserted his first wife—if, indeed, she was not, to some extent, cognizant of, and consenting to, his proceedings—not, indeed, to his marriage, but to the connection he had formed with Miss Bankes. Then, with regard to the latter lady, there could be no doubt that she knew the prisoner was married when she went through the ceremony with him, and that she did so voluntarily. So far, therefore, as these persons were concerned, the case was not one that called for severe punishment. The prisoner had, however, in order to effect his second marriage, been guilty of making a false oath—which he, as a man of education, knew was a grave offence: taking this into account, and also that he had endeavoured to defend himself against this indictment by imputing to his first wife the offence of bigamy, without any justification, he had come to the conclusion that the case required a more severe sentence than was usually passed under similar circumstances. The sentence of the Court was that he be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for one year.

THE POPLAR POISONING CASE.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

*October 27 and 28, 1859.**(Before the Lord Chief Baron and Mr. Justice Williams.)*

George Frederick Royal, aged 31, was indicted for the wilful murder of Zipporah Wright.

The circumstances of this case, apart from the medical testimony, were these. The prisoner was by trade a shoemaker, but had formerly been a carpenter and cab-driver, and had at one time been an errand boy, and then a groom, to two several chemists. He had married a woman who was still living, and had four children; but subsequently deserted his wife, and lived with the deceased woman, who passed as his wife. In November last the prisoner and the deceased went to live in lodgings in Gough-street, Poplar. They were very poor, but lived together upon middling terms. On the 28th April, the deceased, who up to that time appeared in very good health, was delivered of a child, and had a good confinement, and in a fortnight was able to go about. Early in the morning of the 31st May, the prisoner awoke the landlady of the house, and said the deceased had got the cramp in her inside. The landlady advised him to get some brandy, and herself made some tea, and afterwards some gruel and arrowroot. The deceased complained of a burning sensation in the throat and stomach, and sickness, and said that her legs felt quite numbed up to the knees. During the day she vomited several times, and was also purged. A doctor

was sent for, who administered some remedies. The condition of the patient at this time was such as to raise doubts in the mind of the landlady, who told the prisoner that his wife's condition was very suspicious, and that he ought to send for a doctor. The prisoner said he would go for a doctor if any one would go with him. The landlady therefore accompanied him, and they went to the union doctor, Mr. Webb. The patient appeared to get better; but on the following day the vomiting and purging returned, and was more violent than before. The mother of the deceased had been called to see her daughter, and deriving from conversation with the landlady most violent suspicions against the prisoner, accused him of poisoning her daughter. She afterwards thought she had been too hasty; but a day or two later, when her daughter became worse, complaining of burning in the throat, continual thirst, and pain in the bowels, her suspicions were renewed with increased force. She seized the prisoner by the collar, and said he was the murderer of her child, and that his death-bed would be hell; "which," said the poor woman when giving her evidence, "it will." On this the prisoner washed himself, packed up his tools, and went up to the deceased, kissed her, and left the house, to which he never returned. The same vehement suspicions which had thus driven the prisoner from his home, also induced the women to put questions to the dying woman whether she had taken anything to injure herself; and she replied she had not. She then said that she had taken some coffee, which the

prisoner had made for her, and that it was very bitter; and afterwards exclaimed, "God forgive that man!" meaning the prisoner, repeating the exclamation several times. On the morning of her death her mother told her she could not recover, and asked if she had any ill feeling towards any one. The deceased replied, "No; only I hope God will forgive that wicked man." The suffering woman died on the morning of the 4th June. The cross-examination of these witnesses elicited some facts favourable to the prisoner. It appeared that he was industrious whenever he could get employment, and behaved towards the deceased in a considerate and affectionate manner; that the deceased had been subject to spasms; that the coffee she had taken was without sugar, and therefore of bitter taste; that she had gone with the prisoner to church a day or two before she was taken ill, had got her feet wet, and had not changed her stockings—a circumstance likely to produce very ill consequences to a woman just risen from child-bed; that she had very imprudently drank off two cups of cold water; and that from some cause, she suffered a stoppage of milk; that it was the general talk of the house immediately after she was taken ill that she had been poisoned; that the landlady who had been the first to take alarm, had before seen a person suffering from poison, and that as the symptoms of the deceased were similar to those she had then witnessed, she had come to the conclusion that the deceased's sufferings arose from the same cause. At this time also the public mind was much excited by the

details of the Richmond poisoning case; and the poor neighbours of the suffering woman were open to the suspicions which that event suggested. In the meanwhile the prisoner had fled away from the house of suffering and suspicion, and had found employment at Sydenham. It did not appear that he had changed his name, but he was known only as "Fred." On the 29th August he was taken by a police constable, who gave these circumstances attending his arrest:—"When I saw the prisoner I said, 'Ah, Mr. Royal, how do you do?' He made no answer, but appeared agitated, and looked very pale. I asked him if he did not know me, and he said he did not. I then asked him if he did not know me at Poplar, and he replied, 'Yes, I knew you perfectly well.' I had never seen the prisoner before. I took him upstairs, and he then said, 'I knew you directly I saw you.' I was in private clothes. I then asked the prisoner if his name was not Royal, and he said, 'Oh, yes, my name is Royal.' I then said, in reference to my taking him into custody for poisoning a woman, 'I suppose you understand that?' He replied, 'Yes, I understood that as soon as I saw you.' I then said I supposed since he had been there he had been expecting some one would be after him, and he replied, 'Yes, how could I be any other way.'"

The observation of the doctors, and a subsequent examination of the body having confirmed the suspicion of the family, an application was made to the Home Secretary for assistance; for because of the poverty of the deceased's friends, they were unable

to take any means to bring the accused to justice. The Government directed the matter to be pursued by the Crown officers; the body was exhumed three weeks after death, and the examination of the viscera, &c., give grounds for the supposition that death had not been the result of natural disease; the Solicitor-General was directed to institute a prosecution. The case of the Crown was, that either to rid himself of an incumbrance, or some other motive, the prisoner had destroyed the life of the deceased by poisoning her; and the two facts to be proved were: first, that the death was occasioned by poison; and second, that the prisoner was the person who had administered that poison. To prove these points, a number of medical witnesses were called, whose testimony was necessarily purely professional, and can with difficulty—especially that given on cross-examination—be abridged.

Dr. Webb.—I am a medical officer of the western district of the Poplar Union. In consequence of an order of the relieving officer, I went to see the deceased in the evening of the 31st of May, between 11 and 12 o'clock. The countenance of the deceased presented an appearance of great anxiety, and she told me she felt ill first on the previous night, after taking some coffee, and that she had suffered from vomiting and purging ever since. At first I thought the disease was a violent attack of diarrhoea. On the next day the deceased appeared better, but on Thursday the symptoms all returned in an aggravated form, and the deceased complained of a burning sensation in the throat. The prisoner came

to my surgery on the Wednesday, and said he wished to speak to me privately, and he then said that his wife had been suffering for two years from a certain disease. I told him that would not account for her symptoms, and that she was either suffering from cold or from some irritant. On the Monday after the death I and Mr. Smith made a *post mortem* examination of the body of the deceased. There was some matter of a most acrid kind on the stomach, and in my opinion the death of the deceased was occasioned by the administration of some irritant poison. I form this opinion from the statement of the deceased herself, and the symptoms, and also from the fact that the matter in the stomach of the deceased, upon being applied to the lip of Dr. Letheby, produced a blister and inflammation which lasted two days, and upon being applied to my own tongue it occasioned a tingling and numbness which continued for 20 minutes. I am unable to say what this irritant matter was. It may have been either cantharides or croton oil, or a combination of some other ingredients.

Cross-examined.—There had been a good deal of bowel-complaint in the neighbourhood at this time, and at first I thought this was the disease under which the deceased was suffering. The symptoms, to some extent, were consistent with a case of English cholera, as well as to one of irritant poison. The symptoms were also consistent with a disease called enteritis. Enteritis would be produced by some irritant. Such an ingredient as croton oil would be insoluble in either coffee or water. I was aware that the

deceased had been confined about a month before, and her exposure to wet or cold would be likely to cause peritoneal inflammation; but the symptoms of that disorder would be very different to those exhibited by the deceased. If the deceased had taken cold on the Sunday before her death, the stoppage of the milk on the following Tuesday would be a likely circumstance to occur. In that case the milk would be absorbed into the system, and would cause puerperal fever and generate poison in the system. I can conceive that by some process of nature, a poison may be generated in the system which would cause the death of animals if administered to them, but I have never seen such an instance. I consider it possible that the secretions in the body of a diseased person, where there is no suspicion of poison, might cause death to any animal to which they were administered. Drinking a quantity of cold water would have the effect of deranging the system, and might produce many of the symptoms exhibited in this case. The vomit presented something of the appearance of bile. The taste of bile is anything but pleasant, and in the act of vomiting it would be likely to cause a very unpleasant sensation in the throat.

Re-examined.—Witness knew of one case in which gastro-enteritis had been caused in a strong man drinking a quart of cold water. There was nothing like puerperal fever in this case. The symptoms existed before the milk ceased to be secreted. Having had an opportunity of observing the symptoms of the deceased during life and the appearances of her death, in witness's opinion the

death of the deceased did not arise from any natural disease but from the administration of some irritant poison.

Dr. R. Smith, partner of Dr. Webb, gave the same testimony as to facts, and said:—I was present at the *post mortem* examination, and from all the facts I form the conclusion that the death did not arise from natural causes, but from some irritant.

Cross-examined.—There was nothing in the symptoms he first observed to indicate that the patient was suffering from any other disease than mucous inflammation.

Dr. Letheby.—I am Professor of Chymistry at the London Hospital, and medical officer to the city of London. Four bottles were brought to me on the 8th of June containing portions of the viscera of the deceased and the vomit, and part of the contents of the stomach. I made a chymical analysis of the whole of the contents of the bottles. The stomach was very much softened and inflamed. There was no odour of any volatile poison, and I searched for mineral poisons, but could not find any. I then searched for organic poisons, and from a quantity of treacle-looking liquid I obtained about a drop of an oily liquid, which I found to be exceedingly acrid in taste, and upon applying it to my lip it produced great pain, and in a quarter of an hour several blisters were formed, and the next day there was a scab, which remained two or three days. Upon examining the vomit I discovered in it some of exactly the same description of oily matter I had done before, and there was also some in the contents of the stomach

I could not determine the nature of this acrid matter, and I requested that the body might be exhumed, that I might have further materials for examination; but this did not lead to any result. The total quantity of acrid matter that was obtained was about four grains. At one time I thought this matter might have been cantharides, but from experiments I made I am satisfied it was not. I tried every pure acrid I could obtain, and none of them produced a similar effect to this, except croton oil. I administered a small portion of the matter to a guinea-pig, and it was dead in ten minutes. I then extracted it again from the body of the guinea-pig and administered it to some sparrows. One of them died in four minutes, another in a quarter of an hour. It appeared to occasion death by causing a spasm of the throat. 'I gave some treacle and water to another bird before administering it, and this bird was violently sick in a quarter of an hour and died the next day. Although I cannot state what the nature of the ingredient was, I am satisfied that it was an acrid poison of a very deadly character. I have had a great deal of experience in cases of cholera and diarrhœa, and in my judgment the death in this case did not arise from either of those causes, or from any natural disease, but from the administration of some foreign irritant. I have formed this opinion after deliberation, and I have no doubt upon the subject. I never heard or read in all my experience of a matter of the description I have mentioned being generated spontaneously in the stomach.

Cross-examined.—In my opi-

nion, no *post mortem* action could have produced the appearances that were presented in this case. There was an effusion of blood into the stomach to the extent of two ounces, and I attribute this to the administration of some irritant. The symptoms and the *post mortem* appearances alone would not have led me to suspect poison, but when I found the acrid matter, this accounted for the symptoms and the *post mortem* appearances, and satisfied me that poison had been administered.

Dr. Barker.—I am one of the Physicians of St. Thomas's Hospital. I have heard the whole of the evidence in this case, and from all the symptoms I believe that the deceased did not die from any natural cause. I never knew of death being produced with such symptoms, except from the introduction of some irritant. I do not think that the symptoms in this case are at all consistent with death from diarrhœa or English cholera. The *post mortem* appearances are also inconsistent with English cholera.

Cross-examined.—I have never known the disease called gastro-enteritis except as the result of poison. This disease is a universal inflammation of the lining membrane of the large and small intestines, and it is the general opinion of the profession that it is never produced except in connection with poison. I do not believe that any causes would occasion the generation of poison in the system such as would have produced inflammation of this description. He was aware that the secretions of the body, in certain cases, underwent great changes, but he did not believe that they would ever become so

acid as to cause the death of an animal.

Re-examined.—Having regard to every circumstance connected with this case, I am of opinion that the death of the deceased was caused by the administration of some irritant, and by no other cause.

Dr. Garrod, one of the Physicians to the University College Hospital, confirmed the evidence of the preceding witnesses, and said—"I cannot account for the death in this case in any other manner than by the administration of some irritant poison. There is nothing in the case to lead me to suppose that any poisonous matter was generated in the system after death."

The landlady of the house was recalled, and stated that the deceased was in the habit of putting considerable quantities of "soda" into the teapot; so much, that it made her (the witness) quite ill.

Dr. Letheby, recalled, said that this fact did not alter his opinion of the case; but, on cross-examination, admitted that common soda, or bi-carbonate of soda, if taken in large quantities, would have a chemical effect upon the stomach. It would also act as an irritant, and cause a burning sensation in the throat if taken in large quantities.

Dr. Garrod and Dr. Webb also stated that the fact of the deceased having taken this soda made no difference in the opinion they had formed of the case.

Mr. Sleigh, for the prisoner, said that the Crown had undertaken to prove that the death of the deceased was occasioned by the administration of some irritant poison from without, and that it was by the hand of the prisoner that poison

VOL. CI.

was administered. If these propositions were not made out conclusively, the jury ought to acquit the prisoner; and they had no right to take a leap in the dark, and return a verdict adverse to the prisoner, unless the evidence left no reasonable doubt of his guilt. It appeared to him, that weaker or more meagre evidence in support of a charge of poisoning had never been adduced than had been brought forward on the present occasion; and he hoped to be able not only to satisfy them that there was a reasonable doubt of the prisoner's guilt, but that the evidence failed altogether to establish it, and that, on the contrary, it proved that the deceased died from natural causes, and not from the administration of poison in any form whatever. What were the facts as proved by the prosecution? The deceased was a person of careless habits, and particularly as regarded her health; and it was unnecessary for him to say that, in the condition she was at this time, a very slight cause was likely to have produced serious indisposition. It was proved that, on the Sunday before she was taken ill, she went out in the wet, a very short time after her confinement, and that the prisoner actually remonstrated with her upon the subject, and wished her to take off her boots and stockings. Was it not very probable that she had taken cold on this night, and that this might have produced the illness that terminated so fatally? It was absurd to suppose that any poison had been introduced into the coffee on the Monday night, or the milk on the Thursday. The symptoms described were much more like those of a natural ma-

B B

lady, contracted in the manner he had suggested, than those that would be the result of the administration of poison. Several medical gentlemen, no doubt of high eminence, had been called on the part of the prosecution, and he had the right of calling other medical witnesses to contradict the evidence they had given. How could a person in the humble condition of the prisoner, however, produce such testimony? He had no means to ransack the country and find witnesses who would have come forward to contradict the medical testimony in support of the prosecution, and he was compelled to rely entirely upon the humble exertions of his counsel to show to the jury that they ought not to give effect to the evidence that had been produced to support the theory that the deceased died of poison. He would ask them at once whether they were satisfied that the deceased did not die of natural causes? It was admitted that extraordinary changes did occasionally take place in the secretions of the human body, and that no explanation could be afforded for some of those changes and modifications; and it appeared that, in point of fact, medical science was almost in its infancy as regarded these matters. Why were the jury to be called on in this case, then, to say that the deceased died of poison, when the circumstances of the case would equally justify the conclusion that she died of some poisonous matter spontaneously generated in the system? All the symptoms of the deceased were such, it was also admitted, as were consistent with natural disease. It was just the same with regard

to the *post mortem* appearances—it was admitted that they were not inconsistent with a death arising from natural causes. What was the poison that was made use of? It was said to be a vegetable poison. It was not cantharides, and it was not croton oil; but it was said that croton oil, and some other ingredient combined, might have occasioned the symptoms exhibited by the deceased. But it appeared to him that the jury would incur a most awful responsibility if they entertained such a conjecture. The sister of the unhappy prisoner had been called to show that at one time the prisoner was errand boy to one chemist, and groom to another; and what was the object? Why, to show that this groom and errand boy had obtained sufficient skill while employed by a chemist in these capacities to enable him to make up this extraordinary combination of poison. Was not such a supposition almost absurd? Again, where was the evidence that the prisoner had ever had such articles in his possession, or had ever purchased such ingredients? As to the experiments that had been made upon animals by Dr. Letheby, very little reliance could be placed upon such experiments, as they had no means of knowing the distinction that existed between the system of a human being and that of an animal. What motive was suggested for the commission of such a dreadful crime? His learned friend the Solicitor-General was quite at fault upon this point, and the only suggestion that he made was, that the prisoner might have been anxious to relieve himself from an incumbrance. Where

was the evidence of any quarrelling or ill-feeling between the prisoner and the deceased, or of any desire on his part to get rid of the woman who had been his companion, and whom he had treated kindly for several months? If he had had any intention to destroy the life of the deceased, would he not have made the attempt before she was confined, when he would have rid himself of both incumbrances at once? It appeared to him that this charge never would have been made if the mother of the unfortunate deceased (who evidently entertained no very friendly feeling towards the prisoner) had not first suggested it, and that it was readily adopted by the other woman, owing to the excitement that prevailed at that period in reference to another extraordinary case of the same description. The prisoner, it appeared, was actually charged on the Tuesday night with having poisoned the deceased; all the people in the house were watching him: and yet the jury were called upon to suppose that the prisoner was imbecile enough to persevere in his design, although he must have known that he was certain of detection. The learned counsel then referred to the evidence of what he said was described as the absconding of the prisoner, and said it appeared to him that this ought not to be taken as the slightest indication of guilt, and that this act might very fairly be ascribed to the manner in which he had been treated by the mother of the deceased, and to the threats she had uttered against him.

The Lord Chief Baron said, the prisoner was charged with the offence of causing the death of

Zipporah Wright by poison. This was an offence always difficult of proof; but that made no difference; the jury were bound to see that the crime was proved as strictly as in any other case, and the evidence should be such as would leave no doubt of the guilt of the prisoner in the minds of reasonable men. The counsel for the prisoner had rightly told them that they must not act upon suspicion—that they must not take a leap in the dark, but that they must be satisfied, as reasonable and conscientious men, of the prisoner's guilt before they could convict him of the crime of which he was accused. It was not necessary that the evidence should exclude the possibility of the innocence of a prisoner. If that were so, a conviction could never take place. All that was required was, that the evidence should produce such a conviction upon their minds as would make them feel justified in acting in any important concern of their own lives. The learned counsel appeared to contend that the death had arisen from some extraordinary cause, of the nature of which they were entirely ignorant, and that, therefore, the prisoner ought to be acquitted; but if this doctrine were to prevail, the criminal law could not be carried out, and the jury ought not to come to such a conclusion unless there was evidence to support it, and they ought to look at this case as an ordinary one, and treat it according to the ordinary rules of life. The case was one, undoubtedly, of circumstantial evidence. There was no proof that the prisoner administered poison to the deceased, nor any evidence as to the nature of

the poison that was alleged to be the cause of death; and they must look at all the other circumstances in the case, and decide whether, upon all those facts, they ought to come to the conclusion that the prisoner was guilty or not guilty of the crime of which he was accused. With regard to the medical testimony, every one of the gentlemen who had been examined stated positively that, in his opinion, the death of the deceased was not the result of

any natural disease, but arose from the administration of some irritant. On behalf of the prisoner, on the other hand, it was contended that the poison that was found in the body had been generated in it naturally; and if the jury should think that this was made out, of course the prisoner was entitled to his acquittal.

The jury, after a consultation of about twenty minutes, returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*.

APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

THE MINISTRY OF THE EARL OF DERBY,

As it stood at the Meeting of Parliament, on the 3rd February.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury	Right Hon. Earl of Derby.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Chelmsford.
President of the Council	Most Hon. Marquess of Salisbury.
Lord Privy Seal	Right Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Earl of Malmesbury.
Secretary of State for Colonies	Right Hon. Sir E. G. Bulwer Lytton, Bt.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. Jonathan Peel.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Lord Stanley.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Sir John S. Pakington, Bt.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Joseph Warner Henley.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. Lord John J. Robert Manners.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

General Commanding-in-Chief	H. R. H. Duke of Cambridge.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	His Grace the Duke of Montrose.
Postmaster-General	Right Hon. Lord Colchester.
Paymaster of the Forces, and Vice-President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
President of the Board of Health and Vice-President of the Committee of Privy Council for Education	Right Hon. Charles Bowyer Adderley.
Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law	Right Hon. John Thomas Henry Sutton Sotheron-Estcourt.
Judge-Advocate-General	Right Hon. John Robert Mowbray.
Attorney-General	Sir FitzRoy Kelly, Knt.
Solicitor-General	Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns, Knt.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. Charles Baillie.
Solicitor-General	David Mure, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl of Eglinton.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Joseph Napier.
Chief Secretary	Right Hon. Lord Naas.
Attorney-General	Right Hon. James Whiteside.
Solicitor-General	John George, Esq.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Most Hon. Marquess of Exeter.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl De la Warr.
Master of the Horse	His Grace the Duke of Beaufort.
Mistress of the Robes	Duchess of Manchester.

THE FOLLOWING CHANGES TOOK PLACE BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SESSION ON 31ST MAY.

The Right Hon. J. T. H. Sotheron-Estcourt to be Secretary of State for the Home Department, *vice* Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, resigned.

The Earl of March to be Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law, *vice* Mr. Sotheron-Estcourt.

The Right Hon. Earl of Donoughmore to be President of the Board of Trade, *vice* Right Hon. J. W. Henley, resigned.

Lord Lovaine to be Paymaster of the Forces, and Vice-President of the Board of Trade, *vice* the Earl of Donoughmore.

THE MINISTRY, AS FORMED BY VISCOUNT PALMERSTON
In the Month of June, 1859.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury	Right Hon. Viscount Palmerston.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Campbell.
President of the Council	Right Hon. Earl Granville.
Lord Privy Seal	His Grace the Duke of Argyll.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Sir Geo. Cornwall Lewis, Bt.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Lord John Russell.
Secretary of State for Colonies	His Grace the Duke of Newcastle.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. Sidney Herbert
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, Bt.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.
First Lord of the Admiralty	His Grace the Duke of Somerset.
President of the Board of Trade	
Postmaster General	Right Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Right Hon. Sir George Grey.
Chief Commissioner of Poor Law Board	Right Hon. Thomas Milner Gibson.
Chief Secretary for Ireland	Right Hon. Edward Cardwell.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

General Commanding-in-Chief	H. R. H. Duke of Cambridge.
Paymaster of the Forces, and Vice-President of the Board of Trade	} Right Hon. James Wilson.
Vice-President of the Committee of Privy Council for Education	
Chief Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	} Right Hon. Robert Lowe.
Judge-Advocate-General	
Attorney-General	Right Hon. Henry FitzRoy.
Solicitor-General	Right Hon. Thomas Emerson Headlam.
	Sir Richard Bethell, Knt.
	Sir Henry Singer Keating, Knt.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. James Moncreiff.
Solicitor-General	Edward Francis Maitland, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl of Carlisle.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Maziere Brady.
Chief Secretary	Right Hon. Edward Cardwell.
Attorney-General	Right Hon. John Desmond Fitzgerald.
Solicitor-General	Rickard Deasy, Esq.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon. Earl of St. Germans.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Viscount Sydney.
Master of the Horse	Most Hon. Marquess of Ailesbury.
Mistress of the Robes	Duchess of Sutherland.

THE FOLLOWING CHANGES TOOK PLACE DURING THE YEAR.

- The Right Hon. Thomas Milner Gibson to be President of the Board of Trade.
 The Right Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers to be Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board, with a seat in the Cabinet, *vice* Mr. Milner Gibson.
 The Right Hon. William Hutt to be Paymaster of the Forces, and Vice-President of the Board of Trade, *vice* Right Hon. James Wilson, appointed a Member of the Supreme Council of India.
 The Right Hon. William Francis Cowper to be Chief Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings, *vice* Right Hon. Henry FitzRoy, deceased.
 Sir William Atherton, knt., to be Solicitor-General, *vice* Sir H. S. Keating, a Justice of the Common Pleas.
 Right Hon. Rickard Deasy to be Attorney-General for Ireland, *vice* Right Hon. J. D. FitzGerald, a Baron of the Exchequer.
 Thomas O'Hagan, Esq. to be Solicitor-General for Ireland, *vice* Right Hon. R. Deasy, Attorney-General.

SHERIFFS FOR THE YEAR 1859.

ENGLAND.

Bedfordshire	Richard Longhuet Orlebar, of Hinwick, esq.
Berkshire	Cha. Phil. Duffield, of Marcham Park, nr. Abingdon, esq.
Buckinghamshire . . .	Thomas Tyrwhitt Drake, of Shardeloes, esq.
Camb. and Hunts . . .	John Dunn Gardner, of Chatteris, esq.
Cheshire	Arthur Henry Davenport, of Capesthorpe, esq.
Cornwall	John Tremayne, of Heligan, esq.
Cumberland	Gamel Augustus, Lord Muncaster, of Muncaster Castle.
Derbyshire	The Hon. Edward Keppel Wentworth Coke, of Longford.
Devonshire	John Henry Hipplesey, of Shobbrook Park, esq.
Dorsetshire	James Fellowes, of Kingston House, esq.
Durham	Sir William Aloyzjus Clavering, of Greencroft, bart.
Essex	Champion Russell, of Upminster, esq.
Gloucestershire	John Coucher Dent, of Sudeley Castle, nr. Winchcombe, esq.
Herefordshire	Richard Yapp, of The Halesend, Cradley, esq.
Hertfordshire	Martin Hadsley Gosselin, of The Priory, in Ware, esq.
Kent	Sir Rich. Tufton, of Hothfield Place, near Maidstone, bart.
Lancashire	Sir Robert Tolver Gerard, of Garswood, bart.
Leicestershire	Will. Bosworth, of Charley, esq.
Lincolnshire	Chas. Thos. Samuel Birch Reynardson, of Holywell, esq.
Monmouthshire	Edw. Mathew Curre, of Itton Court, esq.
Norfolk	Hambleton Fras. Custance, of Weston, esq.
Northamptonshire . . .	The Hon. Charles Henry Cust, of Arthingworth.
Northumberland	Henry Charles Silvertop, of Minsteracres, esq.
Nottinghamshire	Henry Sherbrooke, of Oxtou, esq.
Oxfordshire	George Gammie, of Shotover House, esq.
Rutland	Edw. Henry Cradock Monckton, of Seaton, esq.
Shropshire	Chas. Orlando Childe Pemberton, of Millichope Park, esq.
Somersetshire	Edw. Berkeley Napier, of East Pennard, esq.
Southampton, Co. of . .	Robert Vaughan Wynne Williams, of Appuldercombe, in the Isle of Wight, esq.
Staffordshire	William Davenport, of Maer, esq.
Suffolk	John George Sheppard, of Campsey Ash, esq.
Surrey	Sir Walter Rockliff Farquhar, of Polesden, Leatherhead, bt.
Sussex	William Henry Blaauw, of Beechlands, Newick, esq.
Warwickshire	Sir Geo. Rich. Philips, of Weston House, bart.
Westmoreland	William Moore, of Grimes Hill, Kirkby Lonsdale, esq.
Wiltshire	John Neilson Gladstone, of Bowden Park, esq.
Worcestershire	Walt. Chamberlain Hemming, of Spring Grove, Bewdley, esq.
Yorkshire	Sir Lionel Milborne Swinnerton Pilkington, of Chevet Park, near Wakefield, bart.

ELECTED BY THE LIVERY OF LONDON.

London and Middlesex .	{ Thomas Gabriel, esq., Alderman, and Benjamin Samuel Phillips, esq., Alderman.
------------------------	--

WALES.

Anglesey	Henry Owen Williams, of Trearddur, esq.
Breconshire	John Maund, of Tymawr, esq.
Carnarvonshire	John Lloyd Jones, of Broom Hall, esq.
Carmarthenshire	Richard Jennings, of Gellydég, esq.
Cardiganshire	William Price Lewes, of Llysnewydd, near New Castle Emlyn, esq.
Denbighshire	Thomas Lloyd Fitzhugh, of Plas Power, Wrexham, esq.
Flintshire	Philip William Godsal, of Iscoyd Park, esq.
Glamorganshire	Charles Crofts Williams, of Roath Court, esq.
Montgomeryshire	Edward Morris, of Berth Lloyd, esq.
Merionethshire	Hugh John Reveley, of Brynnygwin, esq.
Pembrokeshire	William Owen, of Poyston, esq.
Radnorshire	James Watt Gibson Watt, of Doldowlod, esq.

IRELAND.

Antrim	George Grey, Greymount, Belfast, esq.
Armagh	Joseph Wilson, Lisadoon, Newry, esq.
Carlow	William Clayton Browne, Brown's Hill, Carlow, esq.
Carrickfergus T.	Marriott Robert Dalway, Belle Hill, Carrickfergus, esq.
Cavan	Edward Saunderson, Castle Saunderson, Belturbet, esq.
Clare	Captain Andrew Stackpoole, Riverview, Ennis.
Cork	George Grehan, Clonmeen, Banteer, esq.
Cork City	William Henry Crawford, Lakelands, Cork, esq.
Donegal	Francis S. Mansfield, Ardrummin, Letterkenny, esq.
Down	James C. Price, Saintfield, esq.
Drogheda Town	Christopher Jordan, Drogheda, esq.
Dublin	Sir John J. Coghill, Belvidere House, Drumcondra, bart.
Dublin City	Sir James Power, 20, Harcourt Street, bart.
Fermanagh	John Madden, Hilton, Clones, esq.
Galway	Walter Peter Lambert, Castle Ellen, Athenry, esq.
Galway Town	George E. Burke, Danesfield, Moycullen, esq.
Kerry	Francis Chris. Bland, Derryquin Castle, Sneen, esq.
Kildare	Baron de Roebeck, Swordlestown, Naas.
Kilkenny	Henry Butler, Kilmurray, Thomastown, esq.
Kilkenny City	Michael Purcell, Green Street, Kilkenny, esq.
King's County	Thomas Seymour, Ballymoe Castle, Ballynasloe, esq.
Leitrim	John La Touche, Harristown, Kildcullen Bridge, esq.
Limerick	Heffernan, Considine, Derk, Newpallas, esq.
Limerick City	Andrew Vincent Watson, Limerick, esq.
Londonderry	Lieut.-Col. William St. Leger Lenox Cunningham, Spring Hill, Moneymore.
Longford	Ralph A. Dopping, Derrycassen, Granard, esq.
Louth	Arthur Blackburn, Corderry, Ardée, esq.
Mayo	Francis Rd. O'Grady, Tavrane, Ballaghaderreen, esq.
Meath	Hon. Hercules Langford Rowley, Summerhill House, Summerhill.
Monaghan	Henry G. Johnston, Fort Johnston, Monaghan, esq.
Queen's County	Edmond Dease, Rath House, Ballybrittas, esq.
Roscommon	Hon. Edward Crofton, of Moate Park.
Sligo	Cornelius Alex. Keogh, Tunnagh Lodge, Collooney, esq.
Tipperary	Thomas Saddleir, South Terrace, Borrisokane, esq.
Tyrone	Frederick Lindsay, Loughry, Dungannon, esq.
Waterford	George Whitelocke Lloyd, Shancally Castle, Tallow, esq.
Waterford City	George Augus. Fred. Quentin, Old Court, Waterford, esq.
Westmeath	John Longworth, Glynwood, Athlone, esq.
Wexford	Richard Donovan, Ballymore, Camolin, esq.
Wicklow	Lieut.-Col. Charles J. Tottenham, Woodstock, Newtown-Mountkennedy.

BIRTHS.

BIRTHS.

1858.

NOVEMBER.

16. At Victoria, Hong Kong, the lady of George Whittingham Caine, esq., Officiating Secretary to H.M.'s Plenipotentiary, a son.

DECEMBER.

3. At Raneegunge, Bengal, Mrs. Bruce Lane, a son.

5. At Calcutta, the lady of John Strachey, esq., of the B.C.S., a son.

8. At French Rocks, Mysore, the lady of Major Henry Tulloch, Fifty-second Regt., a son.

17. At Ugbrook House, near Chudleigh, the lady of the Right Hon. Lord Clifford, twins.

21. At Leamington, the lady of John Grant, esq., jun., of Glenmoriston, a dau.

22. At Clifton-wood House, near Bristol, Mrs. Herbert Mackworth, a dau.

— At Highfield, Cheetham-hill, the lady of Robert Gladstone, esq., a dau.

— At Waltham Abbey, Essex, the lady of Col. W. H. Askwith, R.A., a son.

— At Mansfield Woodhouse, the lady of Walter Need, esq., Com. R.N., a dau.

24. At Hanslope Park, Bucks, the lady of Reginald Walpole, esq., a dau.

— At Walford Vicarage, Herefordshire, the lady of Major Brettingham, a dau.

28. At Glenville, near Waterford, the lady of Michael D. Hassard, esq., M.P., a son.

— At Casa Scarpa, Corfu, the lady of Major Hutton, late of the Fourth Dragoons, a son.

30. At Chevet, Lady M. Swinnerton Pilkington, a son.

— At Cleveland-walk, Bath, the lady of Capt. Dumerque, a dau.

1859.

JANUARY.

1. At Victoria-terr., Manchester, the lady of Major Roberts, Twenty-eighth Regt., a dau.

2. At Ivy House, Stranraer, the lady of Maurice Cole, esq., of Paston Hall, Northamptonshire, a dau.

— At Dawson-court, Blackrock, co. Dublin, the lady of William O'Connor Morris, esq., J. P., of twin daus.

— At Waltham House, Mrs. Jolliffe Tufnell, a dau.

3. In Chapel-st., Belgrave-sq., the lady of Dr. Marcet, F.R.S., a son.

— At Southampton, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Cameron, R.E., twin daus.

— At Sandford, near Worcester, the lady of Com. Baldwin A. Wake, R.N., a son.

5. At Peckforton, the lady of J. Tolle-mache, esq., M.P., a son.

6. At Great Cumberland-st., Hyde Park, the lady of Thomas Chambers, esq., a son.

7. At Hopton Hall, Suffolk, Lady Plumridge, a son.

— At Blithfield, Staffordshire, the Lady Bagot, a dau.

8. In The Close, Salisbury, the lady of the Rev. John Ellis, M.A., a son.

— At Paris, Lady Frances Bailles, a son.

9. At Methven Castle, Mrs. Smythe, of Methven, a son.

— At Highnam Court, Gloucester, the lady of T. Gambier Parry, esq., a son.

10. At Albany Villas, Brighton, the lady of C. Manley Smith, esq., a son.

11. The Hon. Mrs. J. Townshend Boscawen, a son.

— At Kedleston, Derbyshire, the Lady Scarsdale, a son and heir.

12. At Florence, the lady of Gerard Lake Brookes, esq., a son.

13. At Beddington Park, Lady Pigott, a son.

15. At Norfolk House, the Duchess of Norfolk, a dau.

— At Hare Hatch House, near Maidenhead, the lady of A. W. Young, esq., M.P., a son.

16. At Dupplin Castle, the Lady Blanche Dupplin, a son.

— At 16, Lower Fitzwilliam-st., Dublin, the lady of The O'Donoghue of the Glens, M.P., a son and heir.

— At Rickerscote, Stafford, the lady of Col. Hogg, a dau.

17. The lady of Lieut.-Col. Armytage, Coldstream Guards, a dau.

— At Sandgate, the lady of Col. Bunbury, C.B., a son.

19. At Dear Park, Honiton, the lady Frances Lindsay, a dau.

20. At the Master's Lodge, Dulwich

378 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

BIRTHS.

College, the lady of the Rev. Alfred J. Carver, Master of the College, a son.

21. The Hon. Mrs. Yarde-Buller, a son.

22. At Stoke, the lady of Major Pearson, Grenadier Guards, Major of Brigade, a son.

23. At Umballah, the lady of Major Dodgson, Deputy Assistant Adj.-Gen., a son.

24. At Queen-st., Mayfair, the Hon. Mrs. Charles Greenhill, a dau.

— At 22, Eaton-place, the Lady Isabella Whitbread, a dau.

— At 23, Wilton-place, Belgrave-sq., the Lady Mary Reade, a dau.

— At Mersham Hatch, near Ashford, Kent, the seat of her father, Sir Norton Knatchbull, bart., the lady of Capt. Charles Stirling Dundas, B.A., a son.

25. At Eccleston-sq., the lady Elizabeth Cust, a son.

26. At Aldershot, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Lowry, Forty-seventh Regt., a son.

28. At 34, Stanhope-st., Park-place, the lady of Edward Scargill, esq., a son.

— At St. Croix, D.W.I., the lady of Frank R. Newton, esq., a dau.

29. At 79, Eaton-sq., the Hon. Mrs. C. Grantham Scott, a dau.

30. At Calcutta, the lady of Sir James Colvill, a son.

31. At 132, Piccadilly, Mrs. C. Wriothesly Digby, a son.

FEBRUARY.

1. At 2, Gloucester-place, Portman-sq., the lady of Sir Charles R. McGregor, bart., a dau.

2. At Bellevue Villa, Dawlish, the lady of Rear-Adm. Henderson, R.N., a dau.

4. At 13, Chester-st., Belgrave-sq., the lady of Major the Hon. William Colville, a dau.

— At 42, Gloucester-st. South, Belgrave, the lady of Horatio Tennyson, esq., a dau.

— In Dover-st., Lady Kelly, the lady of the Attorney-General, a dau.

— At Whitehouse, Morningside, the lady of Sir George Home, bart., a dau.

— At Wellington Villa, New Road, Hammersmith, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hicks, a dau.

6. At Rome, the lady of Col. Astley, Scots Fusilier Guards, a son.

8. At Parkfield, Cheltenham, the lady of Major E. K. Money, B.H.A., a son.

9. At Richmond, the lady of Richard Hassall, esq., M.D., a son.

— At Finborough, Suffolk, the lady Frances Petteward, a dau.

9. At Chatham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Archibald Ross, R.E., a son.

— At Stratton Strawless, Norfolk, the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. Fitzroy, a dau.

10. At Ballinclea, near Dalkey, the Hon. Mrs. R. G. Talbot, a son.

11. At 1, Randolph Cliff, Edinburgh, the lady of Major the Hon. William Yelverton, R.A., a son.

— At Maines House, Berwickshire, the Lady Susan Grant Suttie, a dau.

12. In Wilton-crescent, the Viscountess Newport, a dau.

— At Hartley House, Hants, the lady of Major Milman, R.A., a son.

— At St. James's-sq., Bath, the lady of Rear-Adm. Dacres, a dau.

— At Moxhull Park, Warwickshire, Mrs. Berkeley Noel, a son.

15. At Everton, the lady of Major Chambers, D.L., J.P., a son.

16. At Northwood House, St. John's Wood, the lady of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis, a son.

17. At Witton Park, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Fielden, late Forty-first Regt., a son.

18. At Spains Hall, Essex, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Ruggles Brise, a son.

— The lady of H. S. Thompson, esq., of Kirby Hall, Yorkshire, a son.

— The lady of William Ffooks, esq., of Greenhill, Sherborne, Dorset, a son.

19. At Woolwich, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Erskine, a son.

— At 13, York-terr., Leamington, the lady of Henry Corbett, esq., of Filstone Lodge, Cheshire, a son.

21. At 25, Belgrave-sq., the Hon. Mrs. Horatio Fitzroy, a dau.

— At Edgbaston, the lady of Trehawke Kekewich, esq., a son.

— At Syston-court, Gloucestershire, Mrs. Newton Dickenson, a dau.

22. At Piercy's Hotel, 31, Dover-st., the Viscountess Dalrymple, a dau.

— At Euxton Hall, Lancashire, the Lady Emma Anderton, a son.

— At Half Moon-st., the lady of Beville Ramsay, esq., of Croughton House, Northamptonshire, a dau.

24. At Wimbledon Park, the lady Hermione Graham, a son and heir, and dau.

— At Buckhurst, Sunninghill, the lady of George Ward Hunt, esq., M.P., a son and heir.

— At Montpellier, Weston-Peverel, near Devonport, the lady of Capt. G. E. Patey, R.N., a son.

25. At 48, Eaton-place, the Hon. Mrs. Frederick Byron, a dau.

— At Torquay, the lady of the Rev.

BIRTHS.

Arundell St. John Mildmay, of Lapworth Rectory, a son.

26. At 56, Upper Brook-st., Lady Manners, a son.

— At 26, Upper Grosvenor-st., the lady of George Lyall, esq., M.P., a dau.

27. At Eaton-place South, the Hon. Mrs. Charles Spring Rice, a son.

— At 2, Rue St. Florentin, Paris, the lady of Sir Joseph Olliffe, a son.

28. At 64, Upper Berkeley-st., the lady of Siegerich C. Kreeft, esq., Consul-General for Mecklenburgh-Schwerin, a dau.

— At Ribston Hall, Yorkshire, the lady of John Dent Dent, esq., M.P., a dau.

— At Fulbourn, the lady of C. W. Townley, esq., a dau.

MARCH.

1. At Pinner-grove, the Lady Milman, a dau.

— At Upper Westbourne-terr., Hyde Park, the lady of W. C. Jones Parry, esq., barrister-at-law, a son.

2. At Montpellier-hill, Dublin, Lady Alexander, a son.

— At Chester-st., Grosvenor-place, the lady of Capt. Douglas Galton, R.E., a dau.

— At Canterbury, the lady of E. Grantham, esq., Capt. Ninety-eighth Foot, a son.

— At Moss Park, Toronto, Canada, the lady of the Hon. George Allan, a dau.

3. The Baroness de Robeck, a son and heir.

— At Ham House, Surrey, the Lady Huntingtower, a son and heir.

4. At Foo-Chow-Foo, in China, the lady of Walter Medhurst, esq., H.B.M.'s Consul, a dau.

5. At Lochend, N.B., the lady of George Warrender, esq., a son and heir.

— At Hoveton Hall, Norfolk, the Hon. Mrs. Randall Burroughes, a dau.

— At Holly Grove, Windsor Great Park, the Lady Emily Seymour, a son.

7. At Talacre, Flintshire, the Hon. Lady Mostyn, a son.

— At No. 12, Nottingham-place, Regent's Park, the lady of Sir Charles H. J. Rich, bart., a son.

— At Dove Leys, Staffordshire, the lady of T. Percival Heywood, esq., a dau.

8. At Apps-court, Surrey, the lady of Robert Gill, esq., a son.

— At Peenlee-villas, Stoke Devonport, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Charles Cooper, a son.

10. At Tregunter, Breconshire, the

lady of John Webb Roche, esq., of Rochmount, co. Cork, a son.

10. At 66, Finchley New Road, the lady of the Hon. John Baker, M.L.C., of South Australia, a son.

11. At Yealand Conyers, Lancashire, the lady of Capt. E. Y. Peel, a dau.

13. At 17, Bruton-st., the Countess of Darnley, a son.

— At Hendon, Middlesex, the lady of Rear-Adm. Edward Stanley, a dau.

— At Woolwich, the lady of Major Champion, R.A., a dau.

— At Belmaduthy House, Ross-shire, the lady of Maj. James Wardlaw, a dau.

— In Gordon-st., Gordon-sq., the lady of Sir Stafford H. Northcote, M.P., a son.

— At Rawul Pindee, the lady of Capt. S. B. Cookson, Brig.-Maj., a dau.

14. At 3, Dean-st., Park-lane, Mrs. Hugh Seymour Tremenheere, a dau.

— At Torquay, the lady of the Hon. W. W. Addington, a son.

— At Sir Charles Lyell's, Harley-st., the lady of Chevalier Pertz, a dau.

16. At 2, Lower Berkeley-st., the Lady Annora Williams Wynn, a dau.

— The lady of Major Herbert Russell Manners, a son.

17. At Portishead, near Bristol, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Clutterbuck, a dau.

— At Fort William, Calcutta, the lady of Maj. J. McLeod Innes, Bengal Eng., a son.

18. At 127, George-st., Edinburgh, Lady Gibson-Carmichael, a son.

19. At Drummond-place, Edinburgh, the lady of J. Noel Paton, esq., F.S.A., a son.

20. At Alberbury Vicarage, Salop, the lady of the Rev. G. F. Slade, a son.

22. At 16, Somerset-st., Portman-sq., the lady of Lieut.-Col. Macadam, a son.

— At Bryanston-sq., the Hon. Mrs. Parnell, a dau.

— At Marine-parade, Dover, the lady of Col. Farrant, K.L.S., a son.

— At Woolwich, the lady of Major C. H. Owen, R.A., a dau.

23. At Hope-st., Edinburgh, the lady of T. G. Tollemache-Sinclair, of Benoore, Argyllshire, a dau.

— At Forest Lodge, near Southampton, the lady of Capt. Heath, R.N.C.B., a son.

— At Park House, East Cowes, Isle of Wight, the lady of the Hon. Henry W. Petre, a son.

24. At Maristow, Devon, the Hon. Lady Lopes, a son.

25. At Kensal Manor House, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Percy Douglas, a son.

BIRTHS.

27. At Cole Orton Hall, Leicestershire, the lady of Sir George H. Beaumont, bart., a dau.

— At Wratting Park, Cambridgeshire, Lady Watson, a dau.

— At Frankfort-on-the-Maine, the lady of the Hon. William G. Eden, a son.

— The lady of Thomas B. Bosville, esq., of Ravenfield, Yorkshire, a son and heir.

29. At 16, Wilton-st., Grosvenor-place, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hume, C.B., Grenadier Guards, a dau.

— At 122, Park-st., the Countess of Durham, a dau.

— At 2, Cavendish-sq., the Lady Catherine Petre, a son.

— At Gillingham, Kent, the lady of Major Lovell, C.B., R.E., a dau.

30. At Wilton-crescent, Lady Sebright, a son.

— At the Lion Mansion, Brighton, the Lady Nigel Kennedy, a son.

— At Eveningside, Torquay, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Edward Money, a dau.

— At Lowndes-st., the Hon. the lady of St. John Mildmay, a dau.

— At Anglesea-place, Southampton, the lady of Com. F. D. Rich, R.N., a son.

31. At Busbridge Hall, Godalming, the lady of Ellis Gosling, esq., a dau.

Lately. At Cawnpore, the Hon. Lady Inglis, a dau.

APRIL.

1. At the Grange, Raheny, near Dublin, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Lake White, a son.

— At Foelalt House, Lee, the lady of Col. J. T. Smith, a son.

— At Hassobury, the lady of Capt. Gosling, a dau.

— At Cheltenham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. J. T. Brett, Fourth Madras Cavalry, a dau.

— At Rome, the lady Killeen, a son and heir.

2. At Easter Elchios, Craig-Ellachie, the lady of the Hon. George Essex Grant, of Grant, a son.

3. At Woolwich, the lady of Col. Elwyn, R.A., a son.

— At Spring Hall, Suffolk, the lady of Capt. Tyssen, R.N., a son.

— At the Cleve House, Seend, the lady of Wadham Locke, esq., a dau.

4. At Culzean Castle, the Marchioness of Ailsa, a son.

— At Shirburn Castle, the Countess of Macclesfield, a son.

5. At 10, Grosvenor-place, the Hon. Mrs. Thomas Henry Burroughes, a dau.

— At 16, Cadogan-place, the lady of Col. Henry Dalrymple White, C.B., a dau.

6. At Laverick Hall, Durham, the lady of Capt. George Hawks, a dau.

7. At Hounslow, Middlesex, the lady of Capt. C. W. Parker, late Sixty-ninth Regt., a son.

8. At Woolwich, the lady of Col. F. Eardley Wilmot, R.A., a son.

9. At the Vicarage, Market Lavington, Wilts, the lady of the Rev. Mayow-Wynell, Mayow, a son.

— At Warfield Lodge, Berks, the lady of the Very Rev. Dr. Newman, late Dean of Cape Town, a dau.

— At 23, Eaton-sq., the lady of T. M. Weguelin, esq., M.P., a son.

— At 16, Chesham-place, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Wood, a dau.

10. At 35, Hill-street, Berkeley-sq., Lady Emily Walsh, a son and heir.

— At Coventry, the lady of Capt. Frederick Augustus Hardy, late Ninety-eighth Regt., and member elect for the northern division of the county, a dau.

12. At Rauceby, the lady of Anthony Wilson, esq., M.P., a dau.

13. At 39, Prince's Gate, the Lady Ulrica Thynne, a dau.

— At Abinger Hall, the Hon. Mrs. Sidney Smith, a son.

14. At St. George's-sq., F. Mowatt, esq., the lady of Major F. D. Grey, Sixty-third Regt., a dau.

15. At Cyfarthfa Castle, Glamorgan-shire, the lady of Robert Thompson Crawshay, esq., a son.

— At the Mansion House, Brecon, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Gore Lindsay, a son.

— At Bosworth Hall, the lady of Sir Alexander B. C. Dixie, bart, a dau.

— At 13, Upper Brook-st., Grosvenor-square, the lady of John W. Ogle, esq., M.D., a son.

— At Bath, the lady of Major William Henry Simpson, C.B., a son.

— At Cagebrook, Hereford, Mrs. Reginald Yorke, a dau.

16. At St. Leonard's-on-Sea, the lady of T. Thistlethwayte, esq., Southwick Park, Hants, a son.

17. At Ellerslie, Bickington, North Devon, the lady of Lieut.-Col. R. Wyllie, a dau.

19. At 4, Lower Grosvenor-place, the lady of Sir G. Colthurst, bart., a dau.

— At Ketton Hall, Mrs. Fenwick, a dau.

— At Bellary, India, the lady of Col. Patten, H.M.'s Seventy-fourth Highlanders, a son.

— At Wiesbaden, the lady of Major Forbes, unattached, a dau.

20. At Battleton House, Dulverton, the lady of Richard Bulkeley Thelwall,

BIRTHS.

esq., late Capt. Twenty-fourth Regt., a dau.

20. On the 8th of December, 1855, Mrs. Porter, wife of Richard Porter, of the Britannia Hotel, South Shore, Blackpool, was delivered of three male children, one of whom was stillborn, another lived two days, and the third is now a fine healthy boy; and on Wednesday, the 20th ult., 1859, she was delivered of three female children, all living and healthy.

21. At St. James's Palace, the lady of Capt. Frederic Sayer, a son.

— On board H.M.S. *Perseverance*, in Cork Harbour, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Burmester, Fifty-ninth Regt., a son.

22. At Wilton House, the lady of the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, M.P., a dau.

23. At Ormiston, East Lothian, N.B., the lady of Lieut.-Col. Clephane, a dau.

— At Inwood Henstridge, Somerset, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Glossop, a dau.

24. At Lavender Sweep, Wandsworth, the lady of Tom Taylor, esq., a son.

— At Wootton-House, near Glastonbury, the lady of Capt. Hood, R.N., a dau.

25. At Middleton Tyas, the lady of the Hon. A. C. Orde Powlett, a dau.

— At 138, Piccadilly, the Lady Adelaide Cadogan, a son.

— At Widworthy Rectory, the Hon. Mrs. John Gifford, a dau.

26. At Cheltenham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hall, Bengal Cavalry, a son.

— At Winslade House, Devon, the lady of Henry Aylmer Porter, esq., a son.

27. At Cross House, Aldershot, the lady of Lieut. S. A. Bazalgette, R.A., twin sons.

28. At Brasted, near Sevenoaks, the Lady Affleck, a dau.

— At Upper Ranelagh-st., Chester-sq., the lady of Lieut.-Col. A. Prescott, H.M.'s Bom. Cav., a dau.

— At Hilton Bridgnorth, Shropshire, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Smith Smythe, a dau.

— In Bryanston-sq., the Lady Amelius Wentworth Beauclerk, a son.

— Mrs. Thruston, Talgarth Hall, Merioneth, a son.

— At Portobello, the lady of Capt. Fenton Aylmer, Northumberland Light Infantry, and late Ninety-seventh Regt., a son.

— At Bromley Hill, Kent, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Long, a dau.

Lately. At Troy House, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Curzon, a dau.

MAY.

1. At the Rectory, Corfe Castle, the Lady Charlotte Bankes, a dau.

— At 10, Upper Berkeley-st., Portman-sq., the Hon. Mrs. F. Webb, a dau.

— At Bon Air, Guernsey, the lady of Professor Ansted, a son.

2. At Lansdowne-place, the lady of Charles O'Brien Dilkes, esq., a son.

3. At Cork, the lady of Major George Mein, Twentieth Dep. Batt., a dau.

4. At Hanley, N.B., the lady of Major Babington, Seventh Hussars, a son.

5. At Ampney Park, Cirencester, the Lady Giffard, a son.

6. At Wivianhoe Hall, Essex, the lady of Sir C. C. de Crespigny, bart., a son.

— At King's-house, Spanish-town, Jamaica, the lady of his Excellency Charles Henry Darling, esq., a son.

7. At 10, Upper Grosvenor-st., the lady of Robert Hanbury, esq., M.P., a dau.

— At Spetchley-park, Worcester, the lady of Simon Scrope, jun., esq., of Danby-hall, Yorkshire, a dau.

8. The lady of George Webbe Dasent, esq., D.C.L., a son.

9. At Rutland-gate, Lady Edward Fitzalan Howard, a son.

— At Brighton, the lady of Sir Thomas Barrett-Lennard, bart., a son.

10. At 35, Hertford-st., Mayfair, the Hon. Mrs. Arthur Egerton, a son.

— At Athol-crescent, Edinburgh, Mrs. Scott, of Gala, a son and heir.

11. At Dufferin Lodge, Highgate, Viscountess Hardinge, a son.

— At Foulmire Rectory, Cambridgeshire, the Hon. Mrs. Arthur Savile, a dau.

12. At Edinburgh, the lady of Maj.-gen. Cavaye, a dau.

— At Swanmore, Ryde, Isle of Wight, the lady of Col. John Hill, a son and heir.

13. At Dromoland, co. Clare, the Lady Inchiquin, a dau.

— At the Grove, West Cowes, the lady of Major Vincent Wing, a dau.

— At Woodborough Hall, near Nottingham, Mrs. Mansfield Parkyns, a dau.

— At Alfred-st., the lady of Col. Monkland, Seventy-fourth Highlanders, a son.

14. At Menabilly, the Lady Frances Trevanion, a son.

— At Roundhay Lodge, near Leeds, the Hon. Mrs. William Beckett Danison, a dau.

— At Warwick-villas, Paddington, the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. Stamford, a dau.

382 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

BIRTHS.

15. The lady of Coleridge John Kennard, a son.

16. At 13, Arlington-st., the Hon. Mrs. Henry Forester, a dau.

— At the Rectory-house, Devonshire-sq., the lady of Maj.-Gen. Hutchinson, a son.

17. At Orton Longueville, the Marchioness of Huntly, a son.

— At Sandrock, near Farnham, the lady of Major Charles E. Oldershaw, R.A., A.D.C., a son.

— At Dum Dum, Calcutta, the lady of Major Moir, C.B., Bengal Horse Art., a dau.

18. At Ham, Surrey, the Hon. Mrs. Hamilton Forbes, a dau.

— At Hampton, the lady of Lieut.-Colonel R. S. Shawe, Bombay Army, a son.

19. At 47, Eaton-place, the Lady Alfred Hervey, a son.

20. At 41, Grosvenor-sq., the Lady Charlotte Watson Taylor, a son.

22. At Woolwich, the lady of Col. Franklyn, C.B., R.A., a dau.

— At Monte Video, the lady of Edward Thornton, esq., H.B.M.'s Chargé d'Affaires and Consul-General there, a dau.

23. At Stoneleigh Abbey, Kenilworth, Lady Leigh, a son.

25. At 5, Chesham-st., the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hogg, First Life Guards, a dau.

26. At Downing, North Wales, Viscountess Fielding, a son and heir.

— At Cheltenham, the lady of Rev. George Butler, Vice-Principal of the College, a dau.

— At Pitcairlie, Mrs. Cathcart, of Carbiston, a son.

— At 41, Harley-street, Mrs. Reynell Packe, a dau.

27. At Ockbrook House, Derbyshire, the lady of Edmund Yates Peel, esq., a son.

— At Eglington Hall, Northumberland, the lady of Robert Ogle, esq., a son.

29. At Clifton, the lady of Brev.-Maj. E. C. Butler, Thirty-sixth Regt., a son.

— At 37, Lower Brook-st., the Lady Bateman, a son.

— At Ahmedabad, East Indies, the lady of Major E. W. Agar, a son.

31. At the Glen, Peeblesshire, N.B. Mrs. Tennant, a son.

— At Rowland's Castle, the lady of Capt. O'Callaghan, R.N., H.M.S. *Algiers*, a son.

JUNE.

1. At Ayot St. Lawrence, Lady Emily Cavendish, a dau.

— At Leytonstone, Essex, the lady of T. Fowell Buxton, esq., a dau.

2. At The Grange, Bedale, Yorkshire, the Hon. Mrs. I. J. Monson, a dau.

— At Old Shelmingford Hall, Ripon, the lady of Thomas Kitchenman Staveley, esq., a son.

— At Dowro-terrace, Jersey, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Anderson, C.B., R.A., a son.

3. In Welbeck-st., the lady of Lieut.-Col. W. H. Larkins, a dau.

4. At Marine Villa, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Ralph Smythe, late Bengal Artillery, a son.

— At Hotel Kley, Bon-on-the-Rhine, Prussia, the lady of Lieut.-Col. C. J. Oldfield, a dau.

6. At 38, Belgrave-sq., the Countess of Stradbroke, a dau.

8. At Macauley Buildings, Bath, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Villiers, a dau.

— At Hodnet Rectory, Salop, Mrs. Richard Hugh Cholmondely, a dau.

9. At Berwick-on-Tweed, the lady of Maj. Ellis, First Depôt Batt., a son.

11. At 72, South Audley-st., Lady Worsley, a son.

— In Upper Berkeley-st., Portman-sq., the lady of J. Du Pre Brabazon, esq., Capt. H.M.'s Seventeenth Regt., a dau.

— At Head Quarter House, Hong Kong, the lady of Capt. Bowen van Straubenzee, A.D.L., a dau.

— At Crawley House, Bedfordshire, the lady of O. R. H. Orlebar, esq., late Capt. Twenty-eighth Regt., son and heir.

— At Higham, Leicestershire, the lady of Capt. Carden, a son.

12. At 48, Upper Mount-st., Dublin, the lady of Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, a son.

— At the Castle of Laeken, Her Royal and Imperial Highness the Duchess of Brabant, a prince, heir to the Belgian crown.

13. Lady Wenlock, a dau.

16. At Clifton, near York, the Hon. Mrs. Charles St. Clair, a dau.

— At Bath, the lady of Maj. H. H. A. Wood, Asst.-Adj.-Gen., B.A., a son.

17. At Bedford-sq., Brighton, the lady of Capt. Gore, R.A., a son.

18. At Elmore Court, Gloucestershire, the lady of W. V. Guise, esq., a dau.

BIRTHS.

19. At 12, Hyde Park-st., the Lady Elinor Cavendish, a son.

20. At Horton Manor, Bucks, Lady Yardely, a dau.

— At Straththyrum House, St. Andrew's, the lady of Maj.-Gen. W. J. Gairdner, C.B., B.A., a son.

21. At Bolton-st., the Lady Louisa Agnew, a son.

22. At Leamington Priors, Warwickshire, the lady of Gerard de Witte, esq., a dau.

23. At 35, Harley-st., the Marchioness of Sligo, a dau.

— At Hitcham-grange, Taplow, the Hon. Mrs. Saumarez, a son.

25. At Windleston Hall, Durham, Lady Eden, a son.

26. At Warenes Wood, Mortimer, Berks, the lady of the Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray, M.P., a son.

27. At Campden Hill, Kensington, the lady of Mr. Serjeant Parry, a son.

— At 137, Westbourne-terr., Hyde Park, the lady of Sir Henry Orlando R. Chamberlain, bart., a dau.

— At 138, Avenue des Champs Elysées, Paris, the lady of Maj. Percy Eld, a son.

28. At Chichester, the lady of Capt. W. H. Herrick, Fifty-first (the King's Own) Light Inf., a dau.

29. At Hertingfordbury Rectory, Hertford, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. Godolphin Hastings, a son.

— At 55, Grosvenor-place, the Lady Caroline Ricketts, a dau.

30. At Holkham, the Countess of Leicester, a son.

— At Chaddlewood, Plympton, the lady of Capt. Henry S. Hillwar, C.B., H.M.S. *Cadmus*, a dau.

— At Porchester-sq., the lady of Lt.-Col. A. Park, late B.A., a dau.

JULY.

1. At Ballyarthur, Wicklow, the lady of John Talbot, esq., of Mount Talbot, Roscommon, a son and heir.

2. At Guernsey, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Fagan, Bengal Engineers, a dau.

5. At the Wellington Barracks, the lady of Capt. Anstruther, Gren. Guards, a dau.

— At Corfu, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Gage, a dau.

6. At 52, Notting-hill-sq., the lady of Frederick W. Calvert, esq., H.M.'s Consul at the Dardanelles, a dau.

— The Hon. Mrs. Gordon, Argyll House, a son.

— At Edinburgh, the lady of Col. R. F. Cranford, R.A., a son.

6. At Gartnagrenach House, Argyllshire, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Cuninghame, a dau.

8. At Southborough, Tunbridge Wells, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Hebbert, a son.

— At Guernsey, the lady of Major Lennox, R.A., a dau.

9. At Tunbridge Wells, the lady of J. Pennington Legh, esq., of Norbury Booths Hall, Cheshire, a son and heir.

10. At Ickworth, the lady Arthur Hervey, a dau.

— At Duffryn, Aberdare, the lady of H. A. Bruce, esq., M.P., a son.

11. At 21, Wilton-crescent, the lady of Henry Lowther, esq., M.P., a son.

— At Herbert-st., Dublin, the lady of Capt. Augustus F. Warburton, A.D.C., a dau.

12. At Invergordon Castle, Ross-shire, the lady of R. B. Æ. Macleod, esq., of Cadboll, a dau.

13. Lady A. Spencer Churchill, a dau.

— At Bellary, Madras Presidency, the lady of Major W. Kelly McLeod, H.M.'s 74th Highlanders, a son.

14. At the Lodge, Milverton, Somersetshire, the lady of Major Edwin Marriott, Bengal Army, a son.

16. At 16, Green-st., Park-lane, the lady of George Petre, esq., Secretary to H.M.'s Legation at Hanover, a dau.

— At Altyre, Lady Gordon Cumming, a son.

— At Sandgate, the lady of Major Hoste, C.B., R.A., a son.

17. At Wimbledon, the lady of Professor Creasy, a son.

— At Shawfield House, near Ashe, Surrey, the lady of Major Thomson, R.A., a son.

18. At Waterloo-crescent, Dover, Lady Gooch, a son.

— At 35, Rutland Gate, the Countess of Munster, a son.

— At 42, Belgrave-sq., Lady Octavia Shaw Stewart, a dau.

— At Biarritz, the lady of M. Wyvill, esq., jun., M.P., a dau.

— At Beauchief Abbey, Derbyshire, the residence of her mother, the lady of the Rev. C. A. Assheton Craven, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, a dau.

19. At Eaton-pl., Mrs. Philip Pleydell-Bouverie, a dau.

21. At Stevenage, the lady of the Rev. Edward Cadogan, a dau.

— At Berkeley-sq., the lady of Major Daniell, a dau.

22. At Nettleworth Hall, Nottinghamshire, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Fitzherbert, a dau.

BIRTHS.

22. At Dover, the lady of Capt. E. F. Du Cane, of the R.E., a son.
— At Cheltenham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. R. H. Gall, 14th Light Dragoons, a son.
23. At 10, Gloucester-crescent, Hyde-park, the lady of Col. Willoughby, C.B., a dau.
— At Benwell Tower, Northumberland, the lady of Wm. J. Cookson, a son.
24. At East Lodge, Worthing, the Hon. Mrs. O. W. Lambart, a dau.
25. At Clifton, Staffordshire, the Hon. Mrs. Biber Erskine, a dau.
— At 29, Chesham-st., the lady of W. R. Ormsby Gore, esq., M.P., a dau.
— At Ellastone, the lady of the Rev. Sir C. R. Lighton, bart., twin daus.
26. At 21, Lowndes-sq., the Marchioness of Winchester, a dau.
— At 52, Chester-sq., the lady of Sir Frederick William Heygate, bart., M.P., a son.
27. At Colombo, the lady of Sir William Carpenter Rowe, Chief Justice of Ceylon, a son.
— At St. James's Palace, the Hon. Mrs. Spencer Ponsonby, a dau.
— At the Cathedral-close, Lichfield, the lady of C. Gresley, esq., a son.
28. At Shoeburyness, the lady of Col. Gardiner, R.A., a dau.
— At Rugby, the lady of Col. J. S. Paton, Deputy Quartermaster-Gen., B.A., twin daus.
29. At 83, Eaton-place, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Fyers, C.B., Second Batt. Rifle Brigade, a son.
— At Cannington, Somerset, the Hon. Mrs. H. Clifford, a dau.
30. At Paris, the lady of F. W. M. Bond, esq., M.P., a dau.
— The Hon. Mrs. Augustus Byron, a dau.
— At Quendon Hall, the lady of Henry Byng, esq., a dau.
31. At Southsea, the lady of Col. Edward Somerset, C.B., a dau.
— At Canford, the lady Louisa Ponsonby, a son.
— At Allerton Hall, near Liverpool, the lady of Capt. Inglesfield, R.N., a son.
1. At Worth, Sandwich, the lady of Capt. Henry Boys, R.N., a dau.
2. At Evington-place, Kent, the lady of Sir Courtenay Honeywood, bart., a dau.
3. At Pailton House, Lutterworth, the lady of Capt. Constable Curtis, late Twelfth Royal Lancers, a dau.
— At Canning-st., Liverpool, the lady of T. Stamford Raffles, esq., barrister-at-law, a dau.
4. At the Château de Chichersay, near Vendôme, Berthe, the lady of the Right Hon. William Monsell, M.P., a dau.
5. At Ripley, Surrey, the lady of the Rev. Charles Richmond Tate, a son.
— At Denbies, Dorking, the lady of Geo. Cubitt, esq., a son and heir.
6. In Belgrave-sq., the Lady Katherine Hamilton Russell, a dau.
7. At 27, Rutland-gate, the lady of W. P. Adam, esq., M.P., a son.
— At Congham House, Norfolk, Mrs. Robert Elwes, a dau.
— At Shirehampton, near Bristol, the lady of Col. W. C. Hicks, a son.
9. At Heath House, near Wakefield, the lady of E. A. Leatham, esq., M.P., a son.
11. In Eccleston-sq., the lady of Charles W. Curtis, esq., a son.
— Lady Norreys, a dau.
— At the residence of Baron Hambro, Roehampton, the lady of Charles Hambro, esq., a dau.
12. At 11, Cavendish-place, Brighton, the lady of Mr. Serj. Pigott, a dau.
14. At Ashburne, the Hon. Mrs. Frederick Holland, a son.
— At Belmore House, Hants, the lady of Capt. John Fane C. Hamilton, R.N., a son.
— At Chilton Lodge, Surbiton, the lady of Major Pocock, a dau.
15. At the Haining, Selkirk, the Hon. Mrs. William Napier, a dau.
16. At 57, St. George's-road, Pimlico, the lady of Col. Halkett, Coldstream Guards, a dau.
— At Chamber Hall, near Bolton, the lady of Joseph Crook, esq., M.P., a son.
— At Curzon House, South HUDLEY-st., Lady Burghersh, a son.
— At Abbott's Moss, Northwich, Cheshire, the Lady Frances Lloyd, a son.
— At 63, Rutland-gate, the Hon. Mrs. Ashley Ponsonby, a son.

AUGUST.

1. At the Baths of Lucca, the lady of Alexander Macbean, esq., H.M.'s Consul at Leghorn, a son.
— At Blythwood House, Renfrewshire, the Hon. Mrs. Rowley, a son.
— At 17, Eccleston-sq., Viscountess Ingestre, a dau.
17. At Theodosia, Southern Russia, the lady of Capt. Clipperton, Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul at Theodosia, a dau.
18. At 3, Eaton-sq., the Lady Elizabeth Cartwright, a dau.
— At Kirkee, Bombay, the lady of

BIRTHS.

Col. C. C. Shute, Inniskillen Dragoons, a dau.

19. At Weston-super-Mare, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Price, H.M.'s Bombay Army, a dau.

— At Springvale, Isle of Wight, the Lady Alicia Young, a son.

— At Ingleby Manor, Yorkshire, the Lady De L'Isle and Dudley, a son.

20. At 14, Grosvenor-st., the Lady Augusta Sturt, a son.

— At Kilkea Castle, the Marchioness of Kildare, a son.

21. At 36, Westbourne-terr., the Hon. Mrs. Henry Noel, a dau.

— At Berkeley-sq., the lady of Major Daniell, a dau.

22. The widow of the Right Rev. the late Lord Bishop of Antigua, a dau.

24. At Oak-hill House, Hampstead, the lady of Sheffield Neave, esq., a son.

— At Willenhall, East Barnet, the lady of Charles A. Hanbury, esq., a dau.

— At Eastbourne, the lady of Arthur Mills, esq., M.P., a son.

— At Lauriston Castle, near Edinburgh, the Countess of Eglinton, a dau.

— At Warwick-st., the widow of Lieut.-Col. Charles Holden, a dau.

25. At Breamore, Hants, Lady Hulse, a son and heir.

26. At Abbotabad, Huzara, the lady of Col. Benny, commanding H.M.'s Eighty-first Regiment, a son.

27. At Claremont, near Cape Town, the lady of the Hon. Rowson W. Rowson, esq., C.B., Colonial Secretary of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, a son.

— At Upper Sheen House, Sheen, the Hon. Mrs. James Stuart Wortley, a son.

— At the Hall, Rotherfield, Tunbridge Wells, the lady of the Hon. Henry Bligh, a dau.

28. The lady of Basil Fitzherbert, esq., a son.

— At Park-hill House, Clapham-park, the Hon. Mrs. Augustus Lane Fox, a dau.

— At Surbiton, the lady of Rear-Admiral Nias, C.B., a son.

— At Grafton Underwood, the Hon. Mrs. Courtenay Vernon, a dau.

29. The Hon. Mrs. Edgar Drummond, a dau.

31. At Inverernan, Strathdon, Aberdeenshire, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Forbes, C.B., a son.

— At Eileanach House, Inverness, the lady of Eneas Mackintosh, esq., of Balnispick, a son.

— At Malta, the Lady Frederic Kerr, a dau.

VOL. CI.

31. At Oxford, the lady of the Rev. W. Thomson, D.D., Provost of Queen's College, a son.

SEPTEMBER.

1. At 34, Lower Grosvenor-st., Lady Margaret Charteris, a dau.

— At 11, Devonshire-place, Lady Radstock, a son and heir.

— At the Cedars, Harrow Weald, Lady Bright, a dau.

— The Lady of Thompson Chitty, esq., barrister-at-law, a dau.

2. At Herne Bay, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Sissmore, a son.

— At Blythe Hall, Warwickshire, the lady of Capt. J. D. Wingfield Digby, a son and heir.

— At Bruges, the Hon. Mrs. Robert Dalzell, a dau.

— At Holles-st., Cavendish-sq., the lady of Major Edward Oakes, Sixth Bengal European Regiment, a dau.

3. At Glorat-cottage, Torquay, the lady of Capt. Hockin, R.N., a son.

— At Gibraltar, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Robertson, Hundredth Regiment, a son.

— At Park-st., Grosvenor-sq., the lady of Col. H. Palham Burn, a son.

— At Westbourne-st., the lady of Col. Everest, F.R.S., a dau.

4. The Lady Londesborough, a son.

— At Woolwich, the lady of Capt. W. F. Walker, Royal Artillery, a son.

5. At 20, Belgrave-sq., Lady Cochrane, a son.

6. At Durham, the lady of Edgar Meynell, esq., a son.

— At Southsea, the lady of Major Southwell Greville, a dau.

7. At Maids Moreton Lodge, Buckinghamshire, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Wingfield, a dau.

— At St. George's-road, Eccleston-sq., the lady of Lieut.-Col. Bradford, Grenadier Guards, a dau.

8. At Birkhill, the lady of F. L. S. Wedderburn, esq., of Wedderburn and Birkhill, a son.

— The lady of Hamilton Baillie, esq., of Ash-hall, Glamorganshire, a son.

9. At Clarendon-place, Hyde-park, the lady of Major Boothby, Forfar Militia Artillery, a dau.

10. At Gayton, Norfolk, the lady of the Hon. and Rev. John Harbord, a son.

— At Wilton-crescent, the lady of Major Thomson, late King's Dragoon Guards, a dau.

C C

BIRTHS.

12. At Streatham, Surrey, the lady of George Moffatt, esq., of Eaton-sq., a son.

— At York, the lady of Capt. the Hon. T. A. Pakenham, a son.

13. At 16, Stratford-place, the lady of L. W. Desanges, esq., a dau.

— At 15, Upper Gower-st., Bedford-sq., the lady of Stephen Temple, esq., Q.C., a son, stillborn.

— At Ryde, the lady of the Hon. W. H. Wyndham Quin, a dau.

— At Grosvenor-sq., Mrs. William Davenport Bromley, a dau.

14. At Lauragh, the residence of her father, Sir Erasmus Dixon Burrowes, bart., the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. Meade Hamilton, a dau.

— At Norwich, the lady of Capt. Fox Strangways, R.H.A., a son.

15. At 7, Ainslie-place, Edinburgh, the Countess of Kintore, a dau.

— At the Mount, York, the lady of Major Inglis, a dau.

16. At Fulham, the widow of Francis Berkeley Drummond, esq., a dau.

— At 10, Lewes-crescent, Brighton, the lady of William Ritchie, esq., Adv.-Gen. of Bengal, a son.

— At Wilton House, Brighton, the lady of Robert Bell, jun., esq., of Norris Castle, Isle of Wight, a dau.

18. At Lowndes-st., Mrs. St. Leger Glyn, a dau.

— At Burston Rectory, Norfolk, Mrs. Henry Temple Frere, a son.

19. At Madras, the lady of Sir Adam Bittleston, a dau.

20. At Delamere-terr., Upper Westbourne-terr., the lady of Lieut.-Col. G. Moubray Lys, C.B., late of H.M.'s Twentieth Regiment, a son.

— At Drumlamford House, Ayrshire, the lady of George Ashby-Ashby, esq., of Naseby, Northamptonshire, late Capt. Eleventh Hussars, a dau.

— At Corfu, the lady of Col. Whittingham, C.B., Fourth King's Own, a dau.

— At Blackheath, the lady of Dr. Robertson, D.C.L., a dau.

21. At Buenos Ayres, the lady of Frank Parish, esq., H.M.'s Acting Consul General, a son.

— At Pitfirrane, Fife, N.B., the lady of Sir Arthur Halkett, bart., a dau.

— At the Manor House, Piddletrent-hide, Dorset, the lady of John E. Bridge, esq., a dau.

22. At the Windsor Hotel, Edinburgh, Lady Hunter Blair, a son.

22. At Inverary, her Grace the Duchess of Argyll, a dau.

— At Queen's-gate, Hyde Park, the Lady Isabella Schuster, a son.

23. At Brocket Hall, the Lady Katherine Valletort, a dau.

— At Regency-sq., Brighton, the lady of Frank Orme, esq., of Cleveland-gardens, Hyde Park, a son.

— At Caius House, Cambridge, the lady of Dr. Bartels, a dau.

24. At 17, New-st., Spring-gardens, the lady of Richard Partridge, esq., a son.

25. At Dunlugas, Aberdeenshire, the lady of Major Duff, a dau.

— At Woolwich Common, the lady of Capt. Arthur B. Hawes, India Office, a son.

— At St. John's Cottage, Fulham, the lady of John Jacob Astor, esq., a dau.

26. At 45, Grosvenor-place, the Lady Harriet Wegg Prosser, a son.

— At Cheltenham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Grey, Eighty-fifth Light Inf., a son.

— At Bellefield House, Fulham, the lady of Henry B. Sheridan, esq., M.P., a son.

— At her father's residence, Lamport Rectory, Northamptonshire, the lady of Major Longden, Royal Artillery, a son.

27. At Sconser Lodge, Isle of Skye, Lady Middleton, of Birdsall House, Yorkshire, a dau.

29. At Trabolgan, co. Cork, the Lady Fermoy, a son.

30. At Devonport, the lady of the Hon. Robert Handcock, a dau.

— At 1, Eaton-place south, Mrs. Horace de Vere, a dau.

OCTOBER.

4. At Lansdown-place, Cheltenham, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Brown Constable, a son.

6. At Malta, the lady of Capt. and Brigade Adjt. Richard Oldfield, R.A., a son.

— At Queen's-gate, Lady Trowbridge, a dau.

8. At Hooton Hall, Cheshire, the lady of R. C. Naylor, esq., a dau.

— At Rowling, the lady of N. Hughes D'Aeth, esq., a son.

10. At Manor-place, Edinburgh, the lady of Capt. Robert Cathcart Dalrymple Bruce, Eighth (King's Own) Regiment, a son.

BIRTHS.

10. In lat. 8.10 N., long. 26.30 E., on board the ship *Surrey*, for Calcutta, the lady of Lieut.-Col. H. A. Campbell, C.B., R.A., a son.

11. At Barrackpore, near Calcutta, East Indies, Lady Hearsey, a dau.

— At Upminster, the lady of Osgood Hanbury, jun., esq., a dau.

12. At 10, Chester-sq., the lady of Col. the Hon. A. E. Hardinge, C.B., Coldstream Guards, a son.

— At 46, Charlotte-sq., Edinburgh, the lady of John Turner Hopwood, M.P., a son and heir.

— At Douglas, Isle of Man, the lady of Major Burton, Deputy-Judge-Adv.-General, Secunderabad, a son.

— At Murdustoun Castle, Lanarkshire, the lady of Robert Stewart, esq., a son.

14. At the Friary, Old Windsor, the Countess of Mountcharles, a dau.

— At Laverstoke House, Hants, the Lady Charlotte Portal, a dau.

— At Dolforgan, the lady of R. P. Long, esq., M.P., a dau.

15. At St. Leonard's-on-Sea, the Hon. Mrs. William Style, a dau.

16. At Rugby, the lady of Col. Thorn-dike, R.A., a dau.

— At 12, John-st., Berkeley-sq., the lady of Edward Hugessen Knatchbull-Hugessen, esq., M.P., a dau.

— At Llanleir, the lady of Lieut.-Col. Lewes (unattached), a dau.

17. At 6, Portland-pl., Lady Laura Palmer, a son.

18. At Albemarle-st., Mrs. Scott Plummer, of Sunderland Hall, Selkirkshire, a son.

— At Leamington, the lady of George T. Duncombe, esq., a dau.

19. At 1, High-row, Kensington, the lady of J. C. Horsley, esq., a dau.

— The lady of W. C. Lacey, esq., of Bestwall House, Wareham, Dorset, a son.

— At Shepherd's House, Newlyn, the lady of Capt. Middleton, a dau.

21. At Tapeley Park, North Devon, the lady of W. W. Beach, esq., M.P., a son and heir.

22. At Grosvenor-crescent, Mrs. Antrobus, a son.

23. At Woolwich, the lady of Major C. T. Franklin, C.B., R.A., a son.

— At Brussels, the Princess Th  obald de Vismes et de Ponthieu, a son.

— At Harefield Park, Middlesex, the lady of W. H. Hitchcock, esq., a dau.

— At Ulster-ter., Regent's-park, the

lady of Arthur Kekewich, esq., barrister-at-law, a son.

24. At 2, Park-sq. west, the lady of Samuel Laing, esq., M.P., a son.

25. At Blacklands, Cavendish, Suffolk, the lady of Sir Wm. Parker, bart., a dau.

— At St. Andrew's, Fifeshire, the lady of Maj.-Gen. Moncrieff, a son.

26. At 8, Saville-row, the lady of Dr. Lankester, a son.

27. At Thirkleby Park, Lady Payne Gallwey, a dau.

28. At Kandy, Ceylon, the lady of Col. A. C. Spottiswoode, Thirty-seventh Bengal Native Infantry, twin sons.

— At Pierremont, near Darlington, the lady of Henry Pease, esq., M.P., a dau.

29. At Poltimore Park, the Lady Poltimore, a son and heir.

— At Reddington Manor, near Nottingham, the lady of Sir Thomas Parkyns, bart., a son.

31. At Caversham, near Reading, the lady of Com. Otway Inglefield, R.N., a dau.

— At West Malvern, the lady of Capt. W. S. Jacob, late Director of the Madras Observatory, a son.

NOVEMBER.

1. At Wrockwardine, Salop, the Hon. Mrs. Robert Herbert, a son.

— At H.M.'s Dockyard, Portsmouth, the lady of Capt. J. W. C. Williams, R.N., a son.

— At Moreton-in-Marsh, Gloucestershire, the lady of H. B. White, esq., Solicitor, a dau.

— At Aldeburg, Suffolk, the lady of Major Thelussun, a dau.

2. At Milliken, Renfrewshire, Lady Milliken Napier, a dau.

3. At St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall, the Lady Elizabeth St. Aubyn, a son.

— At Clapham-common, Surrey, the lady of Charles Sumner, esq., barrister-at-law, a dau.

4. At Hill Head House, Dunkeld, N.B., the lady of A. H. Campbell, esq., of Kingston, Canada, a dau.

5. At Brighton, the Hon. Mrs. Philips, a dau.

— At The Limes, Horsham, the Hon. Mrs. Robert Henley, a dau.

— At Edinburgh, Lady Stirling, of Glorat and Renton, a dau.

6. At Ampthill Park, Bedfordshire, the Hon. Mrs. Wm. Lowther, a dau.

BIRTHS.

6. At Kensington Palace, Mrs. Algenon West, a son.
— At Clifton, the lady of C. Spooner, esq., a dau.
— At York Town, Sandhurst, the lady of Capt. Mainwaring, R.A., a dau.
7. At Pickhurst, Kent, the lady of Col. Farnaby Cator, a son.
— At Calcutta, the wife of Lewin B. Bowring, esq., P.C.S., Private Secretary to the Governor-General of India, a dau.
8. At Christ's College Lodge, Cambridge, the lady of the Rev. Dr. Cartmell, Master of Christ's College, a dau.
— At 164, Piccadilly, the Lady Margaret Beaumont, a dau.
— At Bruntsfield House, Edinburgh, the Lady Binning, a dau.
— At Brackley, the Hon. Mrs. Harvie Farquhar, a dau.
— At 13, South Audley-st., the lady of Capt. Labalmondière, a son.
9. At Rutland-gate, Viscountess Bury, a dau.
10. At Riseholme, near Lincoln, the lady of the Bishop of Lincoln, a son.
11. At Spetchley Park, Worcestershire, the lady Catherine Berkeley, a son.
12. At 47, Ebury-st., Eaton-sq., the lady of W. Calder Marshall, esq., R.A., a son.
13. At Bath, the lady of Col. G. H. Robertson, C.B., and A.D.C. to the Queen, a son.
14. At Skelton Castle, Yorkshire, the lady of John Thomas Wharton, esq., a son and heir.
— At Cumberland House, Tunbridge Wells, the Countess de Bylandt, a son.
15. At Norwood Park, Lady Edwin Hill, a son.
— At Stonehouse, the lady of Christopher Bulteel, esq., a dau.
16. At Cortachy Castle, the Countess of Airlie, a dau.
— At Gilling Parsonage, Richmond, Yorkshire, the lady of the Rev. S. L. Astley Cooper, a son.
17. At 5, Chapel-st., Grosvenor-sq., the Hon. Mrs. Francis Stonor, a son.
— At 33, Cadogan-place, the Hon. Mrs. Hay, a dau.
— Lady Roper, a dau.
— At Veitch's Hotel, Edinburgh, Lady Louisa Brooke, a son.
— At West Stoke House, the lady of Sir Henry Roper, a dau.
— At Crescent House, Cheltenham, the lady of George Summers Griffiths, esq., a dau.
18. At 19, Hanover-sq., the Lady Burghley, a dau.
19. In Portland-place, the lady of Sir John W. H. Anson, bart., a dau.
— In The Close, Winchester, the Hon. Mrs. William Warburton, a dau.
— At Cheddington Rectory, Lady Emma Cust, a dau.
20. At Mornington-road, Regent's Park, the lady of Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, of Lincoln's-inn, a dau.
21. At 5, Woburn-place, Russell-sq., the lady of Charles Barry, esq., a son.
24. At 3, Spanish-place, the Hon. Mrs. Leveson Randolph, a son.
26. At 14, Dawson-st., the Hon. Mrs. Handcock, a son.
— At Somerford Park, Cheshire, the lady of Sir Charles Watkin Shakerley, a son and heir.
27. At 78, Chester-sq., the Hon. Mrs. Chetwynd, a son.
29. At Caen, the Lady Audley, a dau.
— At Poltimore Park, the Lady Poltimore, a son and heir.
— At Ruddington Manor, near Nottingham, the lady of Sir Thomas Parkyns, a son.
30. At South parade, Bath, the lady of H. Daubeny, esq., of York-place, Portman-sq., a son.
Lately. At Rackheath Hall, near Norwich, the Hon. Mrs. Milles, a dau.

DECEMBER.

1. At 16, Gratton-st., the Countess Courtown, a son.
— The Hon. Mrs. J. Drummond, a dau.
2. The lady of Maj.-Gen. T. Chase Parr, a son.
— At Boulogne-sur-Mer, the lady of Rear.-Adm. Hathorne, a dau.
3. At Withington Hall, Cheshire, the Viscountess St. Vincent, a son.
— At the Rectory, Sudbury, Derbyshire, the Hon. Mrs. Frederick Anson, a son.
4. At Cranmer Hall, Norfolk, the lady of Sir Willoughby Jones, bart., a dau.
6. At 57, Upper Seymour-st., the Lady Louisa Dillon, a son.
— At 26, East Cliff, Dover, the Viscountess Hawarden, a son.
7. At the Norest, near Malvern, the Hon. Mrs. Norbury, a dau.
9. At Holme Park, Devonshire, the Hon. Mrs. H. Wray, a dau.
— At 135, Piccadilly, the lady of William Miller, esq., M.P., a dau.
— At Kilvington Hall, Thirsk, the Lady Cecilia Turton, a son.

BIRTHS.

9. At Kilvington, Lady Cecilia Twitche, a son.

11. At 58, Rutland-gate, the Lady Raglan, a son.

12. At Pentlow Hall, Sudbury, Suffolk, the Lady Florence Barnardiston, a dau.

— At the Hague, the lady of W. Hope, esq., Attaché to H.M.'s Legation, a dau.

14. At San José, Costa Rica, the lady of Allen Wallis, esq., H.B.M.'s Consul, a dau.

18. At 2, Inverness-terr., Kensington-gardens, the Hon. Mrs. Robert A. J. Drummond, a dau.

— The Lady Hester Leeke, a dau.

19. At Stourton Castle, Staffordshire, the lady of W. O. Foster, esq., M.P., a dau.

— At Hong Kong, the lady of George W. Caine, esq., H.M.'s Consul, Swatow, a son.

20. At Chevet Park, Lady M. Swinner-ton Pilkington, a dau.

— At the Old Park House, Derbyshire, the Lady Anna Chandos Pole, a son.

21. At Ashburnham-place, the Countess of Ashburnham, a dau.

— At Coul House, N.B., the Hon. Mrs. Greville Vernon, a son.

22. At Llanvorda, Salop, the lady of H. B. W. Williams Wynn, esq., a dau.

23. At Thornton-le-Street, the Countess Cathcart, a son.

24. At St. Audries, Lady Acland Hood, a son.

— At Bagdad, the lady of J. M. Hyslop, esq., H.M.'s Officiating Political Agent and Consul-General, a son.

25. At Bensham Hall, Gateshead-on-Tyne, Durham, the lady of Edmond Crawshay, esq., a son.

— At Brussels, the Countess de La-laing, a dau.

26. At Mobile, U.S., the lady of Charles Tulin, esq., H.B.M.'s Consul, a dau.

27. The lady of Sir Godfrey J. Thomas, bart., a dau.

— At Hollybrook, Skibbereen, Ireland, the Lady Emily Becher, a son.

— At Eggesford, North Devon, the Countess of Portsmouth, a son.

28. At Madeira, the Viscountess Ebrington, a son.

29. At St. Andrew's, Fife, N.B., the lady of Sir Charles M. Ochterlony, of Ochterlony, bart., a son and dau. who survived their birth but a few hours.

31. At Methley, Yorkshire, the Hon. Mrs. Philip Savile, a son.

MARRIAGES.

1858.

DECEMBER.

6. At Madras, Capt. Cavendish Fitzroy, of the Sixty-third L. Inf., son of Lord Charles Fitzroy, and Aide-de-Camp to the Governor of Madras, to Mary, dau. of Lumisden Strange, esq., of the Sudr Court of Madras.

1859.

JANUARY.

4. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Capel Hanbury Williams, esq., of the Natal C. S., to Rosamond, dau. of the late W. R. Mesham, M.D., of Bedford.

— At St. George's, Bloomsbury, the Rev. John Kempthorne, B.A., Sur-Master of St. Paul's School, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, to Eliza Gertrude, eldest daughter of Dr. Theophilus Thompson, F.R.S.

— At St. Margaret's, Ipswich, Alexander Crowder Crookshank, Assist.-Com.-Gen., to Annie Katherine, dau. of the late W. C. Fonnereau, esq., of Christ Church Park, near Ipswich, Suffolk.

— At Sefton, near Liverpool, Thos. S. Pakenham, esq., nephew to Sir Richard Pakenham, and cousin to the Earl of Longford, to Josephine Maria, dau. of Peter Bancroft, esq., of Liverpool.

5. At Cheltenham, William E. Taylor, esq., son of Maj.-Gen. Taylor, of Prestbury Lodge, Cheltenham, to Frances Sarah, dau. of the late Christopher Todd, esq.

— At Bamborough, Northumberland, William Henry Johnston, esq., of Malkeny, co. Dublin, Fifty-first Light Inf., to Fanny Lewis Antrobus, dau. of the Rev. Edmund Antrobus.

6. At Arlington church, Col. Bisse Chaloner, of Portnall Park, Surrey, to Henrietta Emma de Salis, dau. of the late Jerome Count De Salis, of Dawley Court, Middlesex.

— At Brighton, Ernest Christian Wilferd, esq., of the Canadian Rifles, to Agnes Harriett, dau. of the Rev. John Arnold-Wallinger, of Brighton.

— At St. Paul's Cathedral, C. B. Garrett, esq., Beng. C. S., to Eliza Maria, dau. of the Hon. F. J. Halliday, Beng. C. S.

MARRIAGES.

8. At Upper Chelsea, Dr. B. Simpson, to Agnes, dau. of the late Brigadier Sibbald, C.B., Bengal Army.

11. At Plymouth, Osborne F. C. Fraser, esq., Lieut. and Adj. Roy. Marines L. I., to Georgina, dau. of Col. Palliser, Roy. Art.

12. At St. Marylebone Church, Ludwig Alexander Wilhelm, son of Baron Von Paleske, of Spengawskén, bei Preuss Stargard, West Prussia, to Emily Maria, dau. of the late Maj. O. G. Stockenström, of the Cape Mounted Rifles.

— At Ramsgate, Sir James Francis Rivers, bart., to Sarah Elizabeth, dau. of George Gambier, esq.

— At Ealing, Capt. Eteson, of the Third (the Buffs) Regt., to Isabella Georgina, dau. of Col. Charles Wetherall.

13. At Knightsbridge, Col. M'Mahon, C.B., Fifth Drag. Guards, son of Gen. Sir Thos. M'Mahon, bart., K.C.B., to Frances Mary, dau. of the late John Holford, esq.

— At Pyrtton Church, Lonsdale Augustus Hale, Roy. Eng., son of Archd. Hale, to Emily Clara, dau. of Hugh Hammersley, esq., of Pyrtton Manor, Oxfordshire.

— At Sydenham, Richd. Playne Smith, esq., Capt. Tenth Roy. Hus., to Albreda de Wiveleslie Beatrice, dau. of the late Capt. Abney.

— At Trinity Church, Sloane-st., the Rev. Samuel Pryer Field, Rector of Debach, Suffolk, to Jane Elizabeth, dau. of the late Rear-Adm. Sir Wm. H. Pierson.

— At Christ Church, Regent's-park, Francis R. Neilson, esq., of Westbourne-terr., Hyde-park, to Miney, dau. of the late Sir H. Willock.

18. At St. Feock, the Rev. Arthur Bouchier Wrey, M.A., to Ellen, dau. of the Rev. Thomas Philippotts, of Porthgidden.

— At St. Andrew's, Kenn, Cecil Henry, son of Geo. Lake Russell, esq., and Lady Caroline Russell, to Katharine, dau. of the late Henry Porter, esq., of Winslade.

— At St. Mary's, Reading, Markland Barnard, esq., to Frances Maria Wilhelmina, dau. of the late William Wingfield Yates, esq.

19. At the Friends' Meeting House, Birmingham, Henry Pease, M.P., of Darlington, to Mary Lloyd, dau. of Samuel Lloyd, of Wednesbury.

— At Mereworth, Kent, Capt. Charles George Tottenham, Scots Fus. Gds., son of Charles Tottenham, esq., M.P., to Catherine Elizabeth, dau. of the Hon. and Rev. Sir Francis Stapleton, bart., Rector.

20. At Cornhill, William Vaughan, esq., of Cleveland-lodge, Middlesborough, Yorkshire, to Mary Anne, dau. of the late H. J. W. Collingwood, esq., of Lillburn-tower and Cornhill-house, Northumberland.

— At Leamington Priors, the Rev. William Knox Marshall, B.D., Prebendary of Hereford, to Elizabeth, dau. of the late Rev. John Storer, M.A.

— At Hove, the Rev. Charles W. Pritchard, M.A., to Caroline Isabella, dau. of the late Capt. Robert Rollo Gillespie, of H.M.'s Fifteenth Hus.

— At Clonlara Church, Alexander Crum Ewing, esq., to Jane, dau. of Vice-Adm. Hayes O'Grady, of Erinagh House, county Clare.

— At the Cathedral, Bombay, Charles Gonne, esq., C. S., to Elizabeth Margaret, dau. of Col. Melvill, Military Sec. to the Government.

22. At the British Embassy, Paris, Edward T. B. Fenwick, esq., to Harriet Frances, dau. of John Amott, esq., of The Cloisters, Gloucester.

25. At Walcot, Bath, Capt. Wm. Lambert Yonge, Roy. Art., to Elizabeth C. Maitland, dau. of Lieut.-Gen. Jervois, Col. of the Seventy-sixth Regt.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Hon. Geo. Watson Milles, son of Lord Sondes, to Miss Stracey, dau. of Sir Henry Stracey, bart., of Rackheath-hall, Norfolk.

— At Madeira, Capt. J. Walter Savile, H.M.I.F., to Sarah Emma, dau. of Geo. Stoddart, esq., late H.B.M.'s Consul at Madeira.

26. At Christ Church, Demerara, Capt. George Kemp Chatfield, H.M.'s Fortyninth Regt., to Caroline Mary, dau. of the late Daniel Blair, esq., M.D., Surg.-Gen. of British Guiana.

— At St. Peter's Church, Eaton-sq., Capt. W. Ross King, Seventy-fourth Highlanders, to Lucan, dau. of the late W. Cumming-Skene-Gordon, esq., of Pitlurg and Parkhill.

27. At Clifton, Capt. Francis Gamble Blood, esq., H.M.'s Sixty-ninth Regt., to Charlotte Constance, dau. of the late John James, esq.

— At Plympton St. Mary, the Rev. Wm. Pollexfen Bastard, to Caroline, dau. of Rear-Adm. Woolcombe, of Hemerdon.

29. At Turin, Prince Napoleon, cousin of the Emperor, to the Princess Clothilde, dau. of the King of Sardinia.

— At St. Mary's Church, Jersey, the Prince Théobald Raule Guillaume, son of

MARRIAGES.

the Prince de Visnes et de Ponthieu, to Caroline Annie, dau. of the late Rev. Richard Adolphus Musgrave, Canon of Windsor, of Barnsley, co. Gloucester.

29. At Bombay, Edward Irvine Howard, esq., to Agnes Mary, eldest dau. of Major T. Stock, Dep.-Adj.-Gen. H.M.'s Indian Army, Bombay.

FEBRUARY.

1. At St. Gabriel's Church, Belgravia, Lieut.-Col. Robert Bruce, of the twenty-third Roy. Welsh Fus., to Mary Caroline, dau. of the late Sir John Montagu Burgoyne, bart., of Sutton, Bedfordshire.

3. At Skelton, near York, Maj. Jenyns, C.B., Eighteenth Hussars, to Rita, dau. of Henry Stafford Thompson, esq., of Fairfield, York.

— At Lymington, Col. Arthur Horne, Thirteenth Light Inf., son of Sir William Horne, to Emma Jane Dicker, dau. of the late Lieut.-Col. Samuel Cleveland, of the Mad. Native Inf.

8. At Windlesham Church, Surrey, the Rev. H. Percy Smith, M.A., incumbent of York Town, to Selina, dau. of Gen. and Lady Elizabeth Thackeray, of The Cedars, Windlesham.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Edmund Buckley, esq. (late Fifteenth King's Hussars), to Mary Honor, dau. of Robert Burton, esq., of Leamington.

— At Wells, Somerset, the Rev. Edward Stokes, Vicar of Staines, to Helen, dau. of the late Very Rev. Thomas Gaisford, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

10. At Almondsbury, William Edmund Curtis, esq., eldest son of Sir William Curtis, bart., of Caynham Court, Ludlow, to Ariana Emily, dau. of Col. Master, of Knole Park, Gloucestershire.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanston-sq., the Rev. William Seymour Hampson, Rector of Stutton, Lincolnshire, to Julia Jane, dau. of Charles Franks, esq.

— At St. Michael's, Chester-sq., Capt. Daniel Alexander McNeill, esq., to Nanette, dau. of Sir Francis Dugdale Astley, of Everleigh, bart.

— At Port of Spain, Trinidad, Robert Farquhar Shaw Stewart, esq., son of the late Sir Michael Shaw Stewart, bart., to Isabella Jane, dau. of the Hon. Charles W. Warner, Her Majesty's Attorney-Gen. of Trinidad.

11. At Marylebone, the Rev. George Philipps, of Jesus College, Oxford, M.A.,

to Gertrude Marianne, dau. of Sir William Fry Channell, one of the Barons of Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer.

12. At Brighton, Lieut.-Col. William E. Gibb, to Catherine Irving, dau. of the late William Irving, esq.

14. At Edinburgh, Henry Gordon Cumming, esq., to Elizabeth Newton, dau. of Major Ludovick Stewart, of H.M.'s Twenty-fourth Regt.

— At Madras, Capt. Charles Elliot, Madras A., to Christina, dau. of the late Sir Alexander Ramsay, bart., of Balmain.

15. At Dublin, Richard C. D. Olivier, esq., of Rock Mills Lodge, Cork, to Catherine, dau. of the late Ven. John Hawtayne, D.D., Archdeacon of Bombay.

— At Aden, Capt. Henry Bird, H.M.'s Fifty-seventh Regt., to Jane Amelia, dau. of R. Waller, esq., Harbour Master, Aden.

17. At Leeds, William Wailes, esq., to Elizabeth Yourstoun, dau. of Sir Peter Fairbairn, of Woodsley House, Leeds.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., George Ayton Whitaker, esq., to Mary Henrietta, dau. of Edward Farrer Acton, of Mayor Gatacre Park.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Major Barnard, Grenadier Guards, son of the late Major-Gen. Sir Henry Barnard, K.C.B., to Caroline Harriet, dau. of Charles Millett, esq.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanston-sq., the Rev. J. Harman, to Mary Jane Fulton, dau. of the late Lieut.-Gen. William Popham, of the H.E.I.C. Service.

— At Brighton, Major Grant Allan, of the Third Regt. Madras L.I., to Catherine Annie, dau. of the late Major Richardson, Seventh L.C.

— At Canwick, near Lincoln, Constance, dau. of Robert Amcotts (formerly Cracroft) esq., of Hackthorn, in same co., to Capt. Tennant, R.N., of Needwood House, Staffordshire.

21. At Roorkee, N.W.P., Bengal, Alexander Howe Brambley, esq., to Sarah Mary, dau. of Sir W. Brook O'Shaughnessy.

22. At Stowford, Albemarle Cator, esq., to Mary Molesworth Cordelia, dau. of Christopher A. Harris, esq., of Haine, Devon.

— At Twickenham, Walter Monteford Westropp, late Capt. in the Nineteenth Regt., to Laura Felicia Susan, dau. of Sir William Clay, bart., of Fulwell Lodge, Twickenham.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Capt. Hervey George St. John Mildmay, R.N.,

MARRIAGES.

of Hazlegrove House, in the county of Somerset, to the Hon. Elizabeth Shaw Lefevre, dau. of the Viscount Eversley.

23. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Pryse Lowder, esq., of Gogerddan, Cardiganshire, and of Buscot Park, Berks, to Louisa Joan, dau. of Captain Lewes, of Llanbar, Cardiganshire.

— At St. John's Church, Angell Town, Brixton, Henry Lorenz, esq., to Beatrice, dau. of the late Forbes M'Neill, and niece of the Right Hon. Lord Colonsay, of Colonsay, and Sir John M'Neill, G.C.B.

— At Her Majesty's Legation, the Hague, the Hon. George Annesley, brother of the Earl of Annesley, to Clementine, dau. of James Annesley, esq., Her Majesty's Consul for North Holland.

24. At Trinity Church, Charles Peyto Shrubh, esq., of Vicar's Hill, Hants, to Henrietta Caroline, dau. of the late Newton Wigney, esq. M.P. for Brighton.

— At North Cadbury, Somerset, Thomas Barnard, esq., M.P., of Cople, Bedfordshire, to Isabella Henrietta Theodora, dau. of Henry Lawes Long, esq., of Hampton Lodge, Surrey, and the Lady Catherine Long.

— At Cheltenham, John Samuel Barnes, esq., of St. Petersburg and Cheltenham, to Sarah Septima, dau. of the late Maj.-Gen. Dunsterville, of The Crescent, Plymouth.

26. At Rome, Frederick Lee Bredell, esq., to Eliza Florence Fox, dau. of W. J. Fox, esq., M.P.

28. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Rev. S. W. Turner, B.A., Oriol College, Oxon, to Emily, dau. of Dr. Aldis, M.D., M.A., Cantab, Chester-terr., Chester-sq.

MARCH.

1. At St. George's Church, Hanover-sq., Maj.-Gen. Sir Thomas Harte Franks, K.C.B., to Rebecca Constantia Elizabeth, widow of the late Samuel Brewis, esq., of Langley House, Prestwich, Lancashire.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Frederick Goulbourn, esq., son of the late Right Hon. Henry Goulbourn, to the Hon. Jemima Townshend Milles, dau. of Lord Sondes.

— At St. Mary's Church, Bryanston-sq., Capt. d'Eyncourt, R.N., son of the Right Hon. Charles Tennyson d'Eyncourt, to the Lady Henrietta Pelham Clinton, dau. of the late, and sister of the present, Duke of Newcastle.

2. At St. Margaret's Church, West-

minster, Henry Calley, esq., of Burderop Park and Overtown House, Wilts, to Emily Augusta, dau. of Mr. Serjeant Wrangham, of The Rooks, Gloucester.

2. At Gracedieu Manor, Leicestershire, Frederic A. Weld, esq., to Filomena Lisle, dau. of Ambrose Lisle Philipps, esq.

— At the Marbeuf Chapel, Paris, Lieut. Henry Needham Knox, R.N., son of the Hon. John Henry and Lady Mabella Knox, to Minna, daughter of Monsieur and Madame Levit.

3. At Fulham Church, James Bontein, esq., to Katherine Cecilia Shelley, grand-dau. of the late Sir John Shelley, bart.

— At Lyme Regis, Dorsetshire, Robert Buchanan Dunlop, esq., of Drumhead, Dumbarton, N.B., and of Sussexgardens, Hyde Park, to Frances Maria, dau. of the Ven. E. J. Burrow, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Gibraltar.

— At St. James's, Piccadilly, T. Vernon Wentworth, esq., only son of F. and Lady Augusta Wentworth, of Wentworth Castle, to Lady Harriet de Burgh, dau. of the Marquis and Marchioness of Clanricarde.

5. At Douglas, Isle of man, J. H. Thompson, esq., son of Admiral Thompson, of Longparish, Hampshire, to Louisa, widow of T. M. Meggit, esq., of Liverpool.

6. At Calcutta, Richard Aufrère Baker, esq., Madras H.A., to Louisa Milner, dau. of Maj.-Gen. Birch, C.B.

7. At Telford, Wilts, William Fane Salis, esq., of Dawley Court, Middlesex, to Emily Harriette Mayne, of Telford Manor.

— At Chiswick, Capt. James Lowndes, esq., of Arthurlie, Renfrewshire, H.M. Body Guard, to Eleanor Jane, dau. of John Marston, esq.

8. At Edenhall Church, William, eldest son of Edward Stanley, esq., of Ponsonby Hall, to Caroline, dau. of Sir George Musgrave, bart., of Edenhall.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Lieut.-Col. Henry Poole Hepburn, Scots Fusilier Guards, to Emily Margaret, dau. of the late William P. Brigstocke, esq., M.P., of Birdcombe Court, Somersetshire.

— At Kilmastulla, Lieut.-Col. Frederick D. Lumley, esq. (unattached), to Agnes, dau. of Francis Spaight, esq., Derry Castle, Tipperary.

— At Bettiscombe, Dorset, J. Hudley, esq., of Seaborough House, Somerset, and of Broadwindsor, Dorset, to Sophia Anne Tatchell, dau. of John Tatchell Bullen, esq., of Marshwood Manor, Dorset.

MARRIAGES.

9. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Maj. Thelusson, Coldstream Guards, to Henrietta, dau. of Mr. and Lady Augusta Wentworth.

14. At Trinity Church, Boston, U.S., Anthony Lefroy, esq., to Elizabeth Ann, dau. of the late William Dampier, esq., of Bruton, Somerset.

15. At Oxton, John Chaworth Musters, esq., of Annesley Park, and Colnwick Hall, Notts, to Caroline Anne, dau. of Henry Sherbrooke, esq., of Oxton, in that county.

— At Wytham-on-the-Hill, John William Cheney Ewart, esq., of Ketton Hall, Rutland, to Jane Anna Lucy, dau. of Lieut.-Gen. Johnson, of Wytham Hall, in the county of Lincoln.

16. At North Creak, Norfolk, Charles North, Capt. Norfolk Artillery, and barrister-at-law, M.P. for Hastings, to Augusta, dau. of the Hon. and Rev. Thomas Keppel.

17. At Hallaton, Capt. Robert Havard Price, H.M.'s B.A., to Charlotte Mary Dent, dau. of the late Sir Henry Bromley Hinrich, of Court Garden, Marlow, Bucks.

— At South Weald, Essex, Henry Fagel, son of John William May, esq., Consul-General of the Netherlands, to Margareta, dau. of James Drane, esq., formerly of Pulham, Norfolk.

— At Corfu, Capt. Newton, of the Buffs, to Ernestine, dau. of Le Chevalier Von Eisenbach, Consul-Gen. of Austria.

— At Bambro, Northumberland, Edmund Crawshaw, esq., of Bensham, Durham, to Mary Jane, dau. of John Mathinson, esq., of Fenham, Northumberland.

19. At St. Mark's, Surbiton, Kingston-on-Thames, Thomas Fortescue, esq., of Suffolk Lawn, Cheltenham, to Louisa Margaret, dau. of the late Major Francis Russell Eager.

31. At the Military Church, Stuttgart, Elizabeth Matilda, dau. of the late Rev. Sir Henry Dryden, bart., to the Baron Frederick William Emilius Pergler von Perglas, of the Royal Wurtemberg Infantry.

— At Ringwood, Charles Castleman, esq., of St. Ives, Hants, to Isabel, dau. of Col. Swinburne, of Ringwood.

and of Highgate, to Mariabella, dau. of John Hodgkin, of Barcombe House, near Lewes.

6. At Hull, George, son of the late Sir William S. Clark, to Charlotte, dau. of the late Rev. F. S. Pope, of York.

7. At Allahabad, East Indies, Capt. John Hudson, esq., H.M.'s Forty-third Regt. Light Inf., Brig.-Maj. at Allahabad, to Isabel Muir, dau. of Maj.-Gen. Chas. F. Havelock, Imperial Ottoman Army.

— At St. Mary's Church, Bath, George, only son of J. Birch, esq., of St. Petersburg, to Catherine Anna, dau. of the late Joseph Hamilton, esq., M.D., of Queenston, Canada West.

— At Heavitree, Exeter, William Richard Wedgwood, esq., to Harriet Maria, dau. of the late Thomas Carr Brackenbury, esq., of Sausthorpe Hall, near Spilsby, Lincolnshire.

— At St. David's, Exeter, Col. H. H. Lloyd, to Caroline, dau. of the late Henry Banham Harris, esq., of Bryanston-sq., London.

— At Doncaster, Capt. Goodison, esq., H.M.'s Twenty-fourth Regt., to Elizabeth Gertrude, dau. of Joseph Davies, esq., of Shrewsbury.

9. At St. Gabriel's, Pimlico, Capt. Wm. J. Carden, H.M.'s Seventy-seventh Regt., to Eliza Jane, only child of the late Henry Palmer Marsh, esq., of Martham Hall, Norfolk.

12. At St. Peter's, Fort William, Calcutta, Lieut.-Col. Scudamore, C.B., H.M.'s Fourteenth (King's) Light Dragoons, to Caroline, dau. of Philip W. Le Geyt, esq., of the Bombay Civil Service, and Legislative Member of the Council of India.

13. At St. Mary's Church, Ealing, M. E. Grant-Duff, esq., M.P., to Anna Julia, dau. of Edward Webster, esq., of North Lodge, Ealing.

14. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Frederic Ludwig Baron Von Stieglitz, of the Glen, co. Armagh, to Hester Anna, dau. of the late George Blacker, of the B.A.

16. At Trinity Church, St. Marylebone, Charles William Moore, Bengal Civil Service, to Rose Frances, dau. of Sir Samuel E. Falkener, bart.

— At Broadwater, near Worthing, Capt. John Bolton, Capt. and Brev.-Maj. R.A., to Henrietta Juliet, dau. of Robert Coffin, esq.

— At Bombay, Alexander Sangster, esq., of Bombay, to Katherine Isabella, dau. of William Crawford, esq., barrister-

APRIL.

6. At the Friends' Meeting House, Lewes, Edward Fry, of Lincoln's Inn,

MARRIAGES.

at-law, Chief Magistrate and Commissioner of Police, Bombay.

19. At West Ham, Essex, Joseph Hutton Dupuis, esq., H. B. Majesty's Vice-Consul at Naples, to Julia Lilly, dau. of Capt. Thomas Strickland, of Plaistow, Essex, and niece of Miss Agnes Strickland, the authoress.

25. At St. James's, Piccadilly, the Rev. Edward W. L. Davies, to Phillis, widow of William Skieving, esq., and dau. of the late Thomas King, esq., of the Manor House, North Huish, Devon.

26. At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Lieut.-Col. Francis Haygarth, Scots Fusilier Guards, to Cecilia Blanche Horatio Seymour, dau. of the late Col. the Right Hon. George L. Dawson Damer.

— At St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S., of London, to Fanny, dau. of Peyton Blakiston, M.D., F.R.S., of St. Leonard's-on-Sea.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanston-sq., Bulkley J. Mackworth Præd, esq., to Emily Maria, dau. of the late William Fane, esq., of the Bengal Civil Service.

— At Ashford, Kent, the Rev. Augustus Pearman, M.A., Vicar of Bethersden, to Caroline Hannah, dau. of the Rev. John Price Alcock, M.A., Vicar of Ashford.

— At Frenchay, near Bristol, Gerald de Courcy Hamilton, Chief Constable of Devon, grandson of John, twenty-sixth Lord Kinsale, to Henrietta Anna, widow of Wallis O. B. H. Buchanan, Lieut. Ninety-second Highlanders.

— At Monk Fryston, George Frederick Peel, esq., to Sarah Hannah, dau. of the late George Althass Staniland, esq., of Brotherton House, Ferry Bridge.

— At Petworth, Capt. Mure, of the Scots Fusilier Guards, eldest son of Col. Mure, of Caldwell, in Ayrshire, to the Hon. Constance Elizabeth, dau. of Lord Leconfield.

— At Paddington, Henry Denis De Vitre, esq., of Purchase Manor, Ditchling, Sussex, to Ellen Sarah, dau. of James Durham, esq., of Leinster Gardens, Hyde Park.

27. At Guildford, Capt. Geo. Frederick Campbell Bray, Ninety-sixth Regt., to Charlotte Frances, dau. of the late Edward Pope, D.D., Archdeacon of Jamaica.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Major James Duff, of the Twenty-third Royal Welsh Fusiliers, to Mary Laura, dau. of Edward James Dawkins, esq.

— At St. Gabriel's Church, Pimlico,

Scipion Filippi, Viscount de Tabj, of Westbourne-place, Eaton-sq., to Jane Anna, dau. of the late Lieut.-Col. Henry Broome.

27. At Oxenford Castle, Mid Lothian, Allan Alexander Maconochie Welwood Younger, of Garroch, to the Lady Margaret Penny Dalrymple, dau. of the Earl of Stair.

— At St. Jude's, Southsea, George Herbert Hale, esq., of H.M.'s Bengal Army, son of Archdeacon Hale, to Frances Shawe Millett, dau. of Mayow Short, esq., of Southsea.

28. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Horace Dormer Trelawny, esq., to Katherine, dau. of Sir John and Lady Jane Walsh.

— At Monkstown, Dublin, James Walker, esq., of Dalry, Edinburgh, to the Hon. Anna Yelverton, dau. of the Viscount Avonmore.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., R. T. Adderley, esq., of Barlaston and Coton Halls, Staffordshire, to Catherine, dau. of Peter Broughton, esq., of Tunstall Hall, Shropshire.

— At Achurch, Northamptonshire, John Nicholas Fazakerley, esq., to the Hon. Georgiana Caroline, dau. of Lord Lilford.

— At St. John's Church, Paddington, Richard Quain, esq., of Cavendish-sq., to Ellen, Dowager Viscountess Midleton.

— At Kersall, Manchester, Sir Kingsmill Grove Key, bart., of Streatham, Surrey, to Louisa, dau. of the late Joseph Armstrong, esq., of Manchester.

— At Singlethorne, near Wassand, Yorkshire, Henry, son of Sir George Strickland, bart., to Cornelia Charlotte Ann, dau. of the late Lieut.-Col. Dumaresq, and niece of the Earl of Lanesborough.

— At Rusper, Sussex, Robert Henry Hurst, esq., of Horsham Park, to Matilda Jane, dau. of James Scott, esq., of the Nunnery, Rusper, and of Cadogan-pl., Belgrave-sq.

— At St. George's, Bloomsbury, Alexander Forbes Tweedie, esq., R.A., to Alice, dau. of Robert Bell, of Gower-st., Bedford-sq.

— At Cheltenham, Chas. J. Champion de Crespigny, esq., to Frances, dau. of the late William Plunkett, esq., barrister-at-law.

— At St. Mary Magdalen, Munster-sq., London, Capt. Alexander Stephen Creyke, R.E., to Mayda, dau. of the late

MARRIAGES.

Edwardes Lyall, esq., Advocate-General at Calcutta.

28. At Trinity Church, Hyde Park, Peter Godfrey, esq., to Henrietta Julia Rhoda Sophia, dau. of the late Rev. Edward Harmer, Ravenhill.

— At Edinburgh, Lieut. Thomas William Oliver, R.N., to Elizabeth, dau. of the Rev. E. S. Murphy.

29. At Edinburgh, the Right Rev. Bishop Terrot, to Charlotte, widow of Lieut.-Col. Edward Madden, Bengal Art.

30. At St. Mary's, Bryanston-sq., Lieut.-Col. Geo. Latham Thomson, Fourth Regt., to Julia Maria, dau. of the late Thomas Hull Plumer, esq., of Canon's park, Middlesex.

MAY.

2. At Rome, Francis Neville Reid, esq., to Sophia Caroline, dau. of the late Sir Thomas Gibson-Carmichael, bart.

— At Mahabuleshurr, Bombay Presidency, Clement Metcalf Browne, esq., Bombay Engineers, to Florence Jessie, dau. of Major Alfred Thomas, Bombay army.

3. At St. Paul's, Rondebosch, Capetown, Capt. Walter Tyler Bartley, Sixth Royal Regiment, to Esther, eldest dau. of Sydney S. Bell, esq., First Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court, Cape of Good Hope.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., James Haywood, esq., of Dosthill House, Warwickshire, to Juliana, dau. of the late Edward Gibbons, esq., and granddau. of Sir William Gibbons, bart.

5. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., John William Watson, esq., son of the Hon. Baron Watson, to Margaret Godman, dau. of the late P. P. Fitzpatrick, esq., of Fitzleet House, Bognor.

— At Cottesbrooke, Northamptonshire, the Rev. R. Gibbings, Vicar of Radley, Berks, to Caroline, widow of the Rev. S. Stockdale, and dau. of the Hon. and Rev. P. A. Irby, Rector of Cottesbrooke.

— At Abbott's Ann, the Rev. James Erasmus Phillips, only son of the Rev. Sir James Evans Phillips, bart., to Mary Margaret, dau. of the Hon. and Rev. Samuel Best, of Abbott's Ann.

— At St. Michael's, Chester-sq., Edward Charles Buller Elphinstone, to Elizabeth Harriette, dau. of the Right Hon. Sir George Clerk, bart., of Penicuik House, N.B.

— At Hove, Sussex, the Rev. Sir George Lewen Glyn, bart., Vicar of

Ewell, Surrey, to Henrietta Amelia, dau. of Richard Carr Glyn, esq.

5. At Finedon, Northamptonshire, Thomas Bagnall, esq., to Fanny, dau. of the late Herbert Mackworth, esq., R.N., and granddau. of the late Sir Digby Mackworth, bart., of Cavendish Hall, Suffolk.

— At Athens, Sidney Locock, esq., Attaché to her Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople, to Abbie, dau. of the Rev. Jonas King, D.D.

7. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., John Cleland, esq., of Stormont Castle, co. Down, to Theresa Maria, dau. of Capt. Leyland, of Haggerstone Castle, Northumberland and Hyde-park House, Albertgate, London.

8. At Cloneybrack, Lieut.-Col. Chidley Coote, of Huntingdon, Queen's County, to Catherine Maria, dau. of the late William P. Brabazon, esq.

10. At St. James's Church, Henry Ayshford Sanford, esq., of Waltham House, Essex, to Emily Catherine Anne, dau. of the late Right Hon. Lord Granville Somerset.

— At St. Luke's, Chelsea, Sir Henry Fletcher, bart., of Ashley Park, Surrey, to Agnes, dau. of Sir John Morillyon Wilson, C.B., K.H., of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea.

11. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Capt. Henry Naugh, to Catherine, dau. of the late William Baker, esq.

— At Chadlington, Oxon, the Rev. William Wales, Chancellor of the Diocese of Peterborough, and Rector of Uppingham, to the Hon. Louisa Diana Spencer, dau. of the late Lord Churchill.

— At Stoke-by-Nayland, William Beeston Long, esq., to Arethusa Marianne, dau. of Sir Charles Rowley, of Tendring Hall, in the same county.

12. At Kimbolton, Hunts, Charles Paget Blake, esq., of Beulah, Torquay, to Mary, dau. of the late William Ainsworth, esq., of Birkett's Bank, near Wigan, Lancashire.

16. At Sevenhampton Rectory, Gloucestershire, the Hon. Mr. Justice Christian, to Mary, dau. of F. E. Thomas, esq.

17. At All Saints', Knightsbridge, Colonel Ferguson, M.P., of Raith, to Emma, dau. of the late James Henry Mandeville, esq.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Rev. Frederick Peel, third son of the late Right Hon. William Yates and Lady Jane Peel, to Adelaide Frances Isabella, dau. of Lord and Lady Sudeley.

MARRIAGES.

17. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Hon. Henry Dudley Ryder, second son of the Earl of Harrowby, to Susan Juliana Maria Hamilton, dau. of Villiers Dent, esq., of Barton Cliff, near Christchurch, Hants.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Henry Thomas Welsh, esq., of Leck Hall, North Lancashire, to Jemima Caroline, dau. of the late Major Edward Jacob Bridges, Royal Horse Artillery.

— At Waterford, Frederick Sleigh Roberts, V.C., Lieut. Bengal Artillery, to Nora Henrietta, dau. of the late John Bews, esq., Seventy-third Foot.

18. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Rev. William J. C. Lindsay, to Rosamond Emily, dau. of the late Frederic Clinton Mundy, esq.

19. At All Saints' Church, Rutland-gate, the Rev. Lethbridge C. E. Moore, M.A. (late Capt. H.M.'s Seventeenth Regiment), to Agnes Emma, dau. of the late Right Rev. Ph. N. Shuttleworth, Bishop of Chichester.

21. At Clifton, Major Henry Stratton Bush, H.M.'s Forty-first (the Welsh) Regiment, to Ellen Peyton, dau. of Benjamin Peyton Sadler, esq., R.N., Clifton.

24. At St. George's Church, Dublin, William Kennedy, esq., of Dublin, to Grace Marian, dau. of the Hon. Mr. Justice Hayes, of Dublin.

— At Calcutta, John Peter Grant, esq., Bengal C.S., to Marion, dau. of Richard Rowe, esq., of Kilburn.

26. At St. Michael's Church, Chester-sq., Lieut.-Col. E. G. W. Keppel, of Lexham Hall, Norfolk, to Harriet Jacqueline, dau. of Sir A. Buller, of Pound, Devon.

31. At St. George's, Hanover-square, George Augustus Pepper, esq., of the Bengal C.S., to the Lady Helen Susanna Catherine Gertrude Ogilvy, dau. of the late Earl of Airlie.

— At St. Peter's, Eaton-sq., the Rev. William Parry, M.A., to Amelia Henrietta, dau. of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir E. Barnes, G.C.B.

— At Osmaston, near Ashbourn, John Bridges Plumtree, esq., to Elizabeth, eldest dau. of Francis Wright, esq., of Osmaston Manor, Derby. Also, at the same time, Frederic Edward Wigram, esq., to Frances, third dau. of Francis Wright, esq.

— At Hougham, near Dover, the Rev. Joseph Wilkinson, to Wilhelmina Catherine Tracey, dau. of the late Sir David James Hamilton Dickson.

31. At Richmond, Weston Parry, esq., of Callow Hill, Monmouth, to Katharine Jean, dau. of the late Rev. Stephen Butler, of Soberton, Hants.

JUNE.

1. At Whitechurch, Shropshire, Lieut.-Col. John Harding Wynell Mayow, late of the second Bengal Fusiliers, to Theodosea, dau. of J. Lee, esq., of Whitechurch.

— At St. George's Hanover-sq., Edward Heneage Dering, esq., late Coldstream Guards, to Georgiana Lady Chatterton.

2. At St. Andrew's, Sir Alexander Grant, bart., to Susan, dau. of Prof. James Frederick Ferrier, University of St. Andrew's.

— At St. John's, Holloway, Colonel Richard Vyvyan, of Trewan Park, Cornwall, to Henrietta Charlotte, eldest dau. of Thos. Lane Crickitt, esq., of Newington-green, Middlesex, and niece of the late Gen. Sir Colin Halkett, K.C.B.

4. At Wiesbaden, George Augustus, Baron Gilsa, of Gilsa, to Mary Ann, dau. of the late Nicholas Hill, esq., of Riga, and widow of the late J. C. Lembke, esq., of Wiesbaden.

— At St. James's, Westbourne-terr., Francis Edward Pratt, esq., Capt. Roy. Eng., to Anna Mary Elizabeth, dau. of William Hurt Sitwell, esq., Devonshire-terr., Hyde Park.

7. At Viewfield House, Nainshire, Henry Rose, esq., of H.M.'s Bengal C.S., son of the late Gen. Sir John Rose, K.C.B., to Jamesina, youngest dau. of James Augustus Grant, esq., of Viewfield.

— At Monkstown Church, Cork, Charles Henry, youngest son of Sir John Kingston James, bart., D.L., to Kate Mary, dau. of the late Rev. John Rowley, LL.D., and niece of the late Admiral Sir Josias Rowley, bart., G.C.B.

— At East Bridgford, Notts, Sir Anchtel Ashburnham, bart., of Guestling, Sussex, to Isabella, dau. of the late Capt. George Bohun Martin, R.N., C.B.

8. At St. James's Church, the Hon. and Rev. Francis Byng, third son of Viscount Enfield, and grandson of Field Marshal the Earl of Strafford, to Florence Louisa, dau. of Sir William Miles, bart., M.P.

— At Dublin, Major W. Barnston, K.L.H., Fifty-fifth Regt., of Crewe-hill, Cheshire, to Mary Emma, dau. of the late Col. King, K.H.

MARRIAGES.

8. At Wootton Gwawen, Phillip Albert, son of the late George Frederick Muntz, esq., M.P., of Umberslade, to Rosalie, dau. of Philip Henry Muntz, esq.

9. At Blatherwycke, the Rev. Edward Salmon Bagshawe, Bulwick, Notts, to Emma Louisa, dau. of Gerard Noel Hoare, esq.

— At Walcot Church, Bath, Capt. Alfred Grey, son of the Hon. Edward Grey, late Lord Bishop of Hereford, to Christina, dau. of the Rev. Calvert R. Jones, of Heathfield, Glamorganshire.

— At Dublin, Robert Higginson Borrowes, esq., Giltown, Kildare, to the Hon. Louisa Catherine Browne, dau. of Lord Kilmaine.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Col. Pierrepont Mundy, son of the late General Mundy, to Harriet Georgina, dau. of Vice-Admiral Sir George Tyler, of Cottrell, Glamorganshire, and widow of the late E. P. Richards, esq., of Plas Newydd.

11. At Christ Church, Hawthorne, near Melbourne, the Hon. Major Hodgson, M.L.C., of Studley, to Isabella Angell, dau. of John Clipperton, esq.

13. Major Charles Edward Mansfield, to Anna Margaret Eliza, dau. of the late Col. the Hon. Augustus Ellis.

14. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Hon. Thos. Lyttelton Powys, eldest son of Lord Lifford, to Emma Elizabeth, dau. of the late Robt. Wm. Brandling, of Low Gosforth, Northumberland.*

— At Brighton, Capt. Arthur Loftus Tottenham, Rifle Brigade, of Glenfarne Hall, co. Leitrim, to Sarah Anne, dau. of the late George Addenbrooke, esq., of Barrow-mount, Gore's-bridge, Kilkenny.

15. At Moray-place, Edinburgh, Capt. George Sinclair, of the Bengal Army, second son of Sir John Sinclair, bart., to Agnes, dau. of the late John Learmouth, esq., of Dean.

16. At Calbourne, Isle of Wight, E. Wilkes Wand, esq., to Elizabeth, dau. of the Hon. William A'Court Holmes, of Westover, in the Isle of Wight.

— At Cologne, William Gage Blake, esq., to Mary, dau. of the Rev. James T. Bennett, Rector of Cheveley, Cambridgeshire.

— At St. James's, Piccadilly, Lieut.-Col. G. W. G. Green, Second E. Bengal Fusiliers, to Ellen, youngest dau. of the late Wm. Carter, esq., of Troy, Jamaica.

18. At St. James's, Piccadilly, Capt. Robert Crowe, Sixtieth Royal Rifles, to

Louisa Emily Elizabeth, dau. of John Easton, esq.

20. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, Lieut. Louis Gaston Salamon, Eighty-third Regt. de Ligne, to Louisa Anna, dau. of the Hon. William Henry Yelverton, of Whitland Abbey, Carmarthenshire.

21. At St. James's, Paddington, A. Leland Noel, esq., third son of Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, to Ella, dau. of Rev. Capel Molyneux.

— At St. Mary's Catholic Church, Chelsea, George M. S. Marquis de Stacpoole, to Maria, dau. of Thomas Dunn, esq., of Montagu-sq.

22. At New Lakenham Church, Norwich, Charles Stephens, esq., to Susannah Lynn, dau. of Lieut.-Col. Cockburn, late Seventy-ninth Highlanders.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Charles d'Arcy Lane Fox, to Louisa Emma, dau. of Thomas Fairfax, esq., of Newton Kyme.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Rev. Filmer Sullivan, to Adelaide, fourth dau. of the late Abel Smith, esq., of Woodall-park, Ware.

— At Bonn-on-the-Rhine, William Macfarlane, esq., of Notting-hill, to Emily Caroline, third dau. of Maj.-Gen. Wavell, K.F., K.C.S., F.R.S.

23. At Lea Church, near Ross, Herefordshire, the Very Rev. Edward Newenham Hoare, Dean of Waterford, to Harriet, widow of the Hon. and Rev. Robert Wilson.

— At Booterstown Church, William Forbes, esq., of Callendar, Stirlingshire, to Rose, dau. of the late John O'Hara, esq., of Raheen, co. Galway, and Lady O'Donel.

— At St. Alfege Church, Greenwich, Com. H. D. Grant, R.N., to Agnes, dau. of Lieut. W. V. Lee, of Greenwich Hospital.

28. In Westminster Abbey, the Rev. Arthur C. Thynne, Rector of Kilkhampton, Cornwall, to Gwenlian E. F. J. Kendall, dau. of the late Russell Kendall, esq.

29. At Edinburgh, Capt. Charles Fellows, R.N., to Louisa Garden, dau. of the late John Todd, esq., of Anislie-place.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Capt. the Hon. Henry Walter Campbell, Coldstream Guards, son of the Earl Cawdor, to Fanny Georgina, dau. of Col. George Campbell.

30. At Swindon, near Cheltenham, John Edward Sutherland Lillie, esq., Bengal C.S., son of Sir John Scott Lillie,

MARRIAGES.

C.B., to Cecilia Mary, dau. of the late Major Justinian Nutt, Bombay Engineers.

30. Colonel Henry George Conroy, Grenadier Guards, son of the late Sir John Conroy, bart., to Fanny, dau. of the late William and Maria Ashburner Brodie Marshall.

JULY.

4. At Halifax, N.S., M. Bowes Daly, esq., son of Sir Dominick Daly, to Joanna, dau. of the Hon. Edward Kenny, President of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia.

5. At Knockin, Shropshire, Major F. B. Ward, R.A., son of the Very Rev. the Dean of Lincoln, to Emily Louisa Gertrude, dau. of Vice-Adm. the Hon. C. O. Bridgeman.

— At St. James's, Piccadilly, George Alanson Cayley, esq., son of Sir Digby Cayley, bart., to Catherine Louisa, dau. of Sir William Worsley, bart., of Hovingham.

— At Weaverham, Cheshire, the Rev. Thomas William Whale, to Emma, Lady Cockburn.

— At Castle Ashby, the Marquess of Northampton to Miss Theodosia Vyner, dau. of Mr. and Lady Mary Vyner, of Newby Hall, Ripon.

— At Clifton, the Rev. George Edward Francis Masters, to Joanna, dau. of the late Richard Strachey, esq., of Ashwick Grove, Somerset, and niece to the late Sir Henry Strachey, bart.

— At Tickhill, Col. Charles Cooke Yarborough, C.B., to Esther Anne, dau. of the late Rev. Alexander Cooke, of Loversall.

— At Batheastone, Somersetshire Joshua Ingham. Brooke, esq., B.A., of University College, Oxford, to Grace Charlotte, dau. of Maj.-Gen. Godby, C.B., of H.M.'s Indian Army.

6. In St. Mary's Church, Newry, Lieut.-Col. Robert Julian Baumgartner, C.B., Sixteenth Reg., to Helen, dau. of the late Ross Thompson, esq., of Greenwood Park, county Down.

7. At St. Mary's, Bryanston-sq., Edmund Waller, esq., to Lucy Georgina, dau. of the late Henry Elwes, esq., of Colesbourne Park.

— At Cockfield, Lieut.-Col. James Dodington Carmichael, Thirty-second Light Inf., to Mrs. Barre Georgina Watson, of Cockfield.

12. At Hornsey, George Puckle, esq., to Fanny Lucy Elizabeth, dau. of J. G. Nicholls, esq., of Richmond-road, Barnsbury-park.

12. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Viscount Boyne, eldest son of the Earl of Shannon, to Lady Blanche Lascelles, sister of the Earl of Harewood.

— At Doveridge, Haughton, Charles Okeover, esq., of Okeover Hall, near Ashbourn, to the Hon. Eliza Ann Cavendish, eldest dau. of the Right Hon. Lord Waterpark.

— At St. Peter's, Eaton Square, Herbert Murray, esq., son of the Bishop of Rochester and Lady Sarah Murray, to Charlotte Lætitia Caroline, dau. of Lieut.-Gen. and the Hon. Mrs. Arbuthnot.

13. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Charles Augustus Drake Halford, esq., to the Hon. Geraldine Frances Lee Dillon, dau. of Viscount Dillon.

— At Brighton, Capt. Sydney Darling, Ninth Regt., son of the late Gen. Sir Ralph Darling, G.C.H., to Rebecca Wilhelmina, dau. of the late Austin Cooper, esq., of Kilmore House, Tipperary.

— At Brathay, Ambleside, the Rev. Samuel Peach Boutflower, Incumbent of Brathay, to Margaret, dau. of the late G. Redmayne.

14. At Broxbourne Church, William Palmer Hale, esq., of the Middle Temple, eldest son of Archdeacon Hale, to Mary, dau. of the late Rear-Adm. Douat Henchy O'Brien.

— At Hampstead, the Rev. Wm. Pester Chappel, M.A., rector of Camborne, Cornwall, to Susan Jane, dau. of William Rivington, esq., of Hampstead.

19. At St. Thomas's Church, Orchard-st., the Rev. Owen Luttrell Mansel, to Louisa Catherine, dau. of the late Lord William Montagu.

— At Lighthorne, Warwickshire, Bolton King, to Louisa, dau. of the late Rev. Charles and the Lady Charlotte Palmer.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Robert Goff, esq., to Una Cameron Barclay, dau. of Lieut.-Gen. Lautour, C.B., K.H., Col. of Third (King's Own) Light Dragoons.

20. At Plymouth, Henry A. Hoare, esq., of Wavendon House, Bucks, and of Oxenham, Devon, son of the late Sir Henry Hugh Hoare, bart., to Julia Lucy, eldest dau. of Thomas Veale Lane, esq., and granddau. of the Right Hon. Pownoll Bastard, second Viscount Exmouth.

26. At St. Pancras Church, the Rev. Pownoll William Phipps, to Elizabeth Dampier, dau. of Shuckburgh Risley, esq., of Mecklenburgh-sq.

— At Walmer, Lieut. Wm. Melanc-

MARRIAGES.

thon Sanctuary, R.N., to Mary Winchester, dau. of Capt. Henry Harvey, R.N., and granddau. of the late Vice-Adm. Sir Thomas Harvey, K.C.B.

26. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Capt. Lovett, of the Second Life Guards, to Miss Morick, niece of the Earl of Verulam.

27. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Reginald Ogilvy, esq., son of Sir John Ogilvy, bart., M.P., to Olivia B. Kinnaid, dau. of Lord and Lady Kinnaid.

— At Broadway, Somerset, John E. Dorington, jun., esq., to Georgina Harriet, eldest dau. of Wm. Speke, esq., of Jordana, Ashill, Somerset.

28. At Launceston, Tasmania, Henry Norman Browne, esq., to Mary Louisa, dau. of Louis W. Le Cesne, esq., of Rio Janeiro.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Rev. Fred. Edward Tyrwhitt Drake, to Maria Diana Charlotte, dau. of the late Mr. and Lady Charlotte Micklethwait, of Taverham Hall, Norfolk.

29. At St. James's, Paddington, Robert Thomas Carew, esq., D.L., of Ballinamona-park, county Waterford, to Henrietta, eldest dau. of Richard Clayton Browne Clayton, esq., D.L., of Adlington Hall, Lancashire, and Carigbyrne, county Wexford.

30. At All Saints', Knightsbridge, Francis Stafford Pipe Wolferston, esq., to Sarah, dau. of W. H. Belli, esq., late of the B. C. S.

— At Falmouth, Robert Constantine Pender, esq., of Budockvean, near Falmouth, to Amelia, dau. of the late Maj.-Gen. Sir W. H. Sleeman, K.C.B., Resident at Lucknow.

— At High Cliff, Maj. Charles John Strange, B.A., to Emma Brownmill, dau. of the late Lieut.-Col. Cameron, K.H., of the Gren. Guards.

AUGUST.

1. Albert Smith, esq., of North End Lodge, Walham-green, to Mary, dau. of Robert Keeley, esq.

2. At St. Saviour's, Paddington, Wm. Rayne Foot, esq., to Mary, dau. of Maj.-Gen. Sir Scudamore W. Steel, K.C.B.

— At Hombourg, near Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Comm. Henry Cholmeley Majendie, B.N., to Thérèse, dau. of the Baron de Baseck Altenbusach, Grand Ecuyer and Chambellan de S. A. de Landgrave de Hesse-Hombourg.

— At St. John's Church, Notting-hill, Wm. Standford Pipe Wolferstan, esq., of Farley, near Cheadle, to Blanch, dau. of

Swynfen Jervis, of Darlaston Hall, Staffordshire.

2. At St. Gabriel's Church, Charles Stuart Aubrey Abbott, esq., to Penelope Mary Gertrude, dau. of Col. and the Hon. Mrs. Rowland Smyth.

— At All Souls', Langham-pl., Mor-daunt Martin Fitzgerald, esq., Bengal Art., to Anna Fraser, dau. of the late Richard Fraser Lewis, esq., of Madras.

— At Keswick, Philip Howard Frere, esq., of Duns-gate, Cambridgeshire, to Emily, dau. of the Rev. Henry Gipps, canon-residentiary of Carlisle, and Vicar of Keswick.

— At Claverton Manor, Somerset, Wm. Stirling Halsey, Bengal C.S., to Sophia Victoria, dau. of the Right Hon. James Wilson, M.P., of Claverton Manor, near Bath, and Upper Belgrave-st., London.

3. At Bray, Max Muller, esq., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, to Georgina Adelaide, dau. of Riversdale Grenfell, esq., of Ray Lodge, Maidenhead.

— George Frederick Buller, esq., son of Sir Anthony Buller, to Georgina, dau. of the late Ralph Forster, esq., of Jardinfield, co. Berwick.

4. At St. John's, Heaton Mersey, Manchester, Charles Patrick Stewart, esq., to Frances Anne, dau. of Wm. Courtenay Cruttenden, esq., of Mount Heaton.

— At Dover, Lieut.-Col. Horace Wm. Montagu, Royal Eng., to Catherine Frances, dau. of Maj.-Gen. England, Royal Art.

7. At the British Embassy, Paris, the Hon. Geo. Augustus Hamilton Chichester, to Elizabeth Lucy Virginia, dau. of T. H. Oliver, esq., of the Manor House, Bath.

9. At Coolock Church, John Knight Fitzherbert, esq., son of the late Sir Hen. Fitzherbert, bart., to Arabella Penelope, dau. of the late Wm. White, esq., of Shrubs, Dublin.

— At Newfoundland, Lieut. Jas. Bower Balfour, to Martha Maria, dau. of the Hon. G. H. Emerson, Q.C., of Virginia Water, St. John's, Newfoundland.

— At Dalhousie Castle, Sir Jas. Fergusson, bart., of Kilkerran, Ayrshire, to the Lady Edith Christian Ramsay, dau. of the Marquis of Dalhousie.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Sir S. Villiers Surtes, Chief Justice of the Mauritius, to Barbara Eliza, dau. of the late Rev. Wm. Bosworth, of Charley Hall, Leicester.

— At St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, the Hon. George Mostyn, eldest son of the Lord Vaux, of Harrowden, to Mary Monk, dau. of the late Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

MARRIAGES.

9. At Canford Magna, Richard Du Cane, esq., to Charlotte Maria, dau. of the late Sir Josiah John Guest, bart.

— At Stapleton, Salop, Henry de Winton, esq., to Caroline Gertrude, dau. of the Rev. Henry and the Lady Emily Harding.

10. At Easby, Major Archibald Alex. Douglas, Royal Marine Light Inf., to Sarah Frances, dau. of Richd. Machel Jaques, esq., of Eastby Abbey and Silton Hall, Yorkshire.

— At Bristol, Col. William Robert Nedham, to Mary, dau. of the late Comm. Baker, R.N.

— At Gothenburg, David Wemyss, esq., to Marie, dau. of Col. de Waldkisch, Schaffhausen, Switzerland.

11. At Hampton Church, Middlesex, Wm. James Turner, esq., to Elizabeth Laura, dau. of the late Right Hon. Lord Chief Justice Doherty.

12. At Hove, Brighton, Lieut.-Gen. Pattle, C.B., formerly commanding the Bengal Third Cavalry, to Jane Anne, widow of the late Capt. Theodore Hickson, of the 80th Foot, and dau. of the Rev. R. P. Brooke.

— At Godalming, Edmond Walcott, esq., to Ellen, dau. of the late J. H. Frankland, esq., Esling Park, Godalming.

13. At Brighton, James D. Dick, esq., son of Sir Chas. Dick, bart., to Josephine, dau. of B. Smithers, esq.

16. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Edmund Robert Spearman, esq., son of Sir Alexander Young Spearman, bart., to Lady Maria Louisa Fitz-Maurice, dau. of the Earl of Orkney.

17. At St. James's, Westminster, Sir Walter Buchanan Riddell, bart., to Alicia, dau. of the late William Ripley, esq., Fifty-second Light Inf.

18. At All Souls', Langham-place, Capt. John Cassidy, H.M.'s Sixty-eighth Light Infantry, to Margaret, dau. of John David A. Hill, esq., of Gressenhall-hall, Norfolk.

— At St. John's, Highgate, Capt. Davenport M'Gill, Sixtieth Royal Rifles, to Rosa, dau. of Thomas Bisgood, esq.

23. At Shorwell, Isle of Wight, Charles Greig, esq., of Clifton, grandson of his Excellency Sir Samuel Greig, formerly Lord High Admiral of Russia, to Emily Lucy, dau. of the late Rear-admiral Renwick, of Honiton, Devonshire.

— At the Mauritius, James Barton, esq., B.A., to Mary Barbara, dau. of Sir David Barclay, bart.

— At Hackness, near Scarborough, Robert Swann, esq., to Blanche Maria,

dau. of Sir John V. B. Johnstone, bart., M.P.

24. At Five Mile Town, Tyrone, Capt. Richard Weld Litton, late of the Thirtieth Regiment, to Mary, dau. of the late Sir Hugh Stewart, bart.

25. At St. Mary's, Woodford, Essex, Charles Ainslie, esq., son of the late Sir Robert Sharpe Ainslie, bart., to Emma, dau. of the late James Peppercorne, of Woodford, Essex, esq.

— At Enterkine, Robert Agnew Wallace, esq., son of the late General Sir J. A. Wallace, bart., to Jane Colquhoun, dau. of John Bell, esq., of Enterkine, Ayrshire.

— At Kirkheaton, Robert Hartley Bower, esq., of Welham, near Malton, to Marcia, dau. of Sir John Lister Kaye, bart., of Denby Grange, near Wakefield.

— At Stockwell, John Hurrell, esq., of the Middle Temple, to Susan, widow of Capt. Elston, of Brixton, and dau. of the late George Tandy, esq., of Bromsgrove.

27. At Malta, Capt. Arthur Forbes, R.N., of H.M.S. *Renown*, to Léonie Emma, dau. of C. Mareseaux, esq., of St. Omer.

— At All Souls', Langham-pl., Major Hardinge, Eightieth Regt., to Jemima Elizabeth, dau. of the late Francis Ayerst, esq., of Brompton, Kent.

29. At Winteringham, Lincolnshire, Robinson Fowler, esq., of the Inner Temple, to Anne Agnes, dau. of the late Hon. and Very Rev. Henry David Erskine, Dean of Ripon.

30. At Halstead, Kent, David Power, esq., Q.C., to Mary Cornwallis, dau. of the Rev. F. Lipscomb.

SEPTEMBER.

1. At St. James's, Piccadilly, Capt. M. Copplestone, of Copplestone, Devon, to Emma Matilda, dau. of the late Thomas Winstanley, esq.

6. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., James Brogden, esq., of Tondü House, Glamorgan, to Ellen Dunbar, dau. of the late Capt. Milne, of the Twenty-fourth Bombay N.I., Deputy Commissary General.

— At Taplow Church, the Rev. Seymour Neville, son of the late Dean of Windsor and Lady Charlotte Neville Grenville, to Agnes Mary, dau. of the late Rev. Charles Proby, Canon of Windsor and Vicar of Twickenham.

— At St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Rear-Admiral Hastings, of Thornelee, near Worcester, to Mary Ann, widow of the Rev. James Volunt Vashon.

7. At the Chapel, Lathom House,

MARRIAGES.

Ynwr Henry Burges, esq., to Edith, third dau. of the late Hon. Richard Bootle Wilbraham, and sister of Lord Skelmersdale.

8. The Lord William Godolphin Osborne, son of the Duke of Leeds, to Mary Catherine, dau. of John Headly, esq., of Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire.

— At St. Peter's Church, Eaton-sq., by the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of York, Thomas Francis Fremantle, esq., eldest son of the Right Hon. Sir Thomas F. Fremantle, bart., to Lady Augusta Henrietta Scott, dau. of the late Earl of Eldon.

— At All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge, Hugh Lindsay Antrobus, esq., son of Sir Edmund Antrobus, bart., to Mary, dau. of the late Admiral Sir Chas. Adam, K.C.B.

— At Belton, near Grantham, Colonel Clark Kennedy, C.B., to Charlotte Isabella Cust, dau. of Hon. Lieut.-Col. Cust, and niece to the Duke of Buccleuch.

— At Llanfairarybryn, Llandovery, Herbert Crawshay, esq., to Mary, dau. of Capt. Lewes, of Glanbrane Park, Carmarthenshire.

— At Bovington, Alexander Henry, only surviving son of Mr. and Lady Ross, to Juliana, dau. of William Moseley, esq., of Leaten Hall, Staffordshire.

9. At St. Mary's, Lambeth, S. F. Stanley, esq., late of H.M.'s Fifth Dragoon Guards, to Eliza Wakefield, dau. of the late J. Talbot, esq., of Stanningfield Hall, Suffolk.

12. At Edinburgh, William Bremner Hay, esq., S.S.C., to Margaret Spottiswood, dau. of the late John Cockburn, esq., of Parkhead.

13. At Wellshot House, Lanarkshire, Capt. Maclean, Rifle Brigade, son of Sir George Maclean, K.C.B., to Anne Parkes, dau. of T. Gray Buchanan, esq., of Scotland.

— At Northumberland, U.S., Major Harry Toulmin, of Mobile, Alabama, to Fanny Priestley, of Northumberland, great granddaughter of the late Rev. Dr. Priestley.

— At Llanstinan Church, Pembrokeshire, the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, Rector of Christ Church, St. Marylebone, to Mary, dau. of the Hon. Mr. Justice Crompton.

— At Arley Chapel, Cheshire, William Edward Brinckman, esq., son of Sir Theodore Brinckman, of St. Leonard's, bart., to Mary Alice, dau. of Rowland

E. Egerton Warburton, of Arley Hall, esq.

13. At St. Oswald's Catholic Church, Ashton, Lancashire, the Right Hon. Lord Stafford, to Emma Eliza, dau. of Frederick Gerard, esq., of Aspull House, Wigan.

14. At the British Legation, Dresden, Julian Pauncefoot, esq., of the Inner Temple, to Selina Fitzgerald, dau. of the late Major William Cubitt, of Catfield, Norfolk.

15. At Colwinstone, Glamorganshire, Charles Mansfield, esq., of Froome Hall, Stroud, to Rosa Ida, dau. of Lieut.-Gen. Darling, Colonel of H.M.'s Ninety-eighth Regt. of Foot.

— At Bridlington, Yorkshire, J. Wilson Holme, esq., of Beckenham, Kent, to Caroline, dau. of the Rev. C. J. Fynes-Clinton, Rector of Cromwell, Notts.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Capt. J. Murray, Grenadier Guards, to the Lady Agnes Caroline Graham, dau. of his Grace, the Duke of Montrose.

20. At Hampstead, the Rev. Henry George Rolt, son of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir John Rolt, K.C.B., to Fanny Paulet, dau. of Colonel James Wood.

— At Egloskerry, Launceston, Colonel Willoughby Trevelyan, First Regt. Bombay L.C. (Lancers) to Elizabeth Lethbridge, dau. of the Rev. Henry Addington Simcoe, of Penheale.

21. At Acomb, near York, Major George Preston Vallancy, H.M.'s Indian Army, to Jane Mary, dau. of Capt. T. W. Yates, of Southsea.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Commr. John H. Cave, esq., R.N., to Louisa, only dau. of George Ellis, esq., of Tingly Hall, Yorkshire.

— At St. Marylebone, Robert Augustus Carden, son of Sir Robt. W. Carden, to Caroline Gertrude, eldest dau. of John Arnold Mello, esq.

22. At Tidmarsh, the Rev. Septimus Henry Lee Warner, of Walsingham, Norfolk, to Jane, dau. of John Hopkins, esq., of Tidmarsh House, Berks.

26. At Hampton Court, Col. the Hon. James Macdonald, to the Hon. Miss Blake, dau. of Lord and Lady Wallscourt.

27. At Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Col. Charles Smith, to Eliza Guyon Triscott, dau. of the late Capt. Joseph Triscott, R.M., of Richmond, Surrey.

— At St. Mary's Catholic Chapel, Chelsea, John Daniel King, esq., to Caroline Georgiana, dau. of Sir Frederick

402 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

MARRIAGES.

Slade, of Maunsel Grange, in the county of Somerset, bart., Q. C.

27. At Pitminster, Somerset, Vincent John Reynolds, esq., of Canon's Grove, Somerset, to Jessie, dau. of the late Rev. T. Bowse Lethbridge, Rector of Combe Flory, Somerset, and granddau. of the late Sir Thomas Bucklor Lethbridge, bart.

— At Trinity Church, Marylebone, William Ashburner Forbes, esq., of the Bengal C.S., to Laura Charlotte, dau. of the late S. Grove Price, esq., M. P.

— At Hove, Arthur de Hochepeid Larpent, esq., eldest son of Baron de Hochepeid Larpent, to Catherine Mary, dau. of Col. Melvill, Military Secretary to the Government of Bombay.

28. At Roseneath Manse, N.B., Stephen Edward FitzGerald, esq., son of the late Right Hon. Maurice FitzGerald, Knight of Kerry, to Margaret Stewart, dau. of the Rev. Robert Story.

— At St. Mary's, Carlisle, Edwin Guest, esq., LL.D., of Sandford Park, Oxfordshire, and Master of Caius College, Cambridge, to Anne, widow of the late Major Banner, and dau. of Joseph Ferguson, esq., of Morton, Carlisle.

— At Aughton, Rear-Admiral Drake, of Castle Thorpe, Bucks, to E. Adelaide, dau. of Samuel Richardson, esq.

29. At Tetbury, Gloucestershire, Capt. Nathaniel Frederick Ellison, of Upton Grove, North Gloucester Militia, to Sarah Augusta, eldest dau. of Maurice Maskelyne, esq., of Upton House, near Tetbury.

— At West Horsley, Edward Robert Sullivan, esq., son of Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Sullivan, bart., to Mary, dau. of Henry Currie, esq., of West Horsley-place.

— At Felton, Northumberland, Baron Edward de Riederer, Councillor of Legation to the Bavarian Embassy at Rome, to Rosalie, dau. of Colonel Sir William Davison, of Swarland Park, and of Lanton, in the county of Northumberland.

30. At St. Pancras Church, Sir William Windham Carmichael Anstruther, of Westraw and Carmichael, bart., to Mary Ann, dau. of John Parsons, esq.

Martha, the widow of the late Henry Petre, of Dunkenhall, Lancashire.

1. At Brightling Church, Sussex, Maj.-Gen. John Ludlow, H.E.I.C.S., to Bella Leigh, dau. of Benjamin Smith, esq., of Blandford-sq., and of Glottenham, Sussex.

4. At Kenwyn, the Rev. P. Southmead Glubb, vicar of St. Anthony, to Isabella, dau. of the late Rev. John Polwhele, of Polwhele, Cornwall.

— At All Saints', Knightsbridge, the Rev. William Arthur Duckworth, to the Hon. Edina Campbell, dau. of the Lord Chancellor and the Lady Stratheden and Campbell.

— At Withycombe Raleigh, Devon, Col. Spencer Clifford, late Grenadier Guards, son of Sir Augustus Clifford, bart., and Lady Elizabeth Clifford, to Emmeline, dau. of the late R. Lowe, esq., H.M.'s Indian Service.

— At St. Thomas's Church, Marylebone, Major Frederick van Straubensee, Thirteenth Prince Albert's Light Inf., to Eliza Meynell, dau. of Robert Crosse, esq., of St. Helier, Jersey.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Charles Campbell Prinsep, esq., to Letitia Elizabeth, dau. of Gordon Willoughby James Gyll, esq., of Wraybury, Bucks.

— At St. James's, Capt. A. B. Fuller, Bengal Art., to Catherine Agnes, dau. of the late Dr. Armstrong, Inspector of Hospitals and Fleets.

— At Wroot, in Bawtry, Maj.-Gen. C. Warren, C.B., to Mary, dau. of the Rev. George Bethell, late Fellow of Eton College.

— At the Cathedral, Waterford, Richard Cary Elwes, esq., of Rigby, Lincolnshire, to Selina, dau. of H. Jephson, esq., of Waterford.

6. At Dublin, James Mouat, esq., C.B. and V.C., Dep.-Insp.-Gen. Army Hospitals, to Adela Rosa Ellen, dau. of the late Rev. Nicolas Tindal, and granddau. of the late Sir Nicolas Conyngham Tindal, L. C. J. Com. Pleas.

— At Toddingdon, Gloucestershire, Charles Henry Maude, esq., son of Capt. the Hon. Francis Maude, R.N., to the Hon. Georgiana Henrietta Emma Hanbury Tracey, dau. of Lord Sudeley.

— Francis Nevil Reade, Twenty-first Fusiliers, to Florence Amelia Louisa, dau. of the Hon. Adolphus Capel, and granddau. of Viscount Maynard.

7. At Edinburgh, the Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, Dean of Dromore, and Vicar-Gen.

OCTOBER.

1. At the Bavarian Chapel, Warwick-st., afterwards at St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Arthur Houlton, esq., to

MARRIAGES.

of Newry and Morne, to Euphemia Elizabeth Anne, dau. of the late Sir William Elliott, bart., of Stobs, Roxburghshire.

8. At Oxford, the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, H.M.'s Inspector of Schools, and Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, to Marion, dau. of the late Edward F. Danvers, esq.

11. At the Cathedral, Bangor, the Rev. Evan Lewis, to Anne, dau. of the Very Rev. J. H. Cotton, Dean of Bangor.

— At Weymouth, Capt. Philip Heatly Douglas, First Devon Militia, to Frances Alice, dau. of Lieut.-Col. Robert Vandeleur, of Springfort, co. Cork, and Weymouth.

— At Barlaston, Staffordshire, John Broughton, esq., to Selina, dau. of the late Ralph Adderley, esq., of Barlaston Hall, Staffordshire.

12. At Benhall, Sir Henry Flower Every, bart., of Eggington Hall, Derbyshire, to Mary Isabella, dau. of the Rev. Edmund Holland, of Benhall Lodge, Suffolk.

— At Richmond, Surrey, Frederick James Gant, esq., Surgeon to the Royal Free Hospital, to Matilda, dau. of the late Richard Crawshaw, esq., of Ottershaw Park, Surrey.

— At Perth, Lieut.-Col. Henry Maurice Drummond, to Charlotte Elizabeth Richardson Hay, of Seggieden and Aberarge.

— At Sydney, New South Wales, the Hon. Louis Hope, son of John, fourth Earl of Hopetoun, to Susan Frances Sophia, eldest dau. of William John Dumaresq, esq.

13. The Rev. T. Trafford Shipman, B.A., Rector of Scaleby, Cumberland, to Margaret Sidney, dau. of the Hon. J. H. Roper-Curzon, of St. John's Lodge, Cheltenham.

17. At the Bavarian Chapel, Warwick-st., Henry, son of Sir Henry Bedingfield, bart., of Oxburgh, to Augusta, dau. of Edward Olavering, esq., of Callaly Castle, Northumberland.

18. At St. Luke's Church, Cheltenham, Capt. J. W. Trevor, of the Seventy-second Regt., A.D.C., to Henrietta Dulcibella, dau. of the late Charles Henry Evans, esq., of Henblas, Anglesea.

— At St. James's, Piccadilly, Clinton Fraser Henshaw, esq., Rifle Brigade, to Isabella Jean Margaret, dau. of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lewis Grant, K.C.H., Col. of H.M.'s Ninety-sixth Regt.

— At St. Michael's Church, Highgate, Alaric Alfred Watts, esq., to Anna Mary

Howitt, dau. of William and Mary Howitt, of West Hill Lodge, Highgate, N.

18. At Stradbally, R. A. G. Cosby, esq., of Stradbally Hall, late Enniskillen Dragoons, to Alice Sofia Elizabeth, dau. of Sir George Pocock, bart., of the Priory, Christchurch, Hants.

19. At the British Embassy in Paris, Dr. Gasper Obrist, of Zollickon, near Zurich, to Alice Jane Grant, dau. of the late James Cunningham Grant Duff, esq.

— At Howden, Yorkshire, Henry W. Allfrey, esq., to Catherine Elizabeth, dau. of the late Philip Saltmarshe, esq., of Saltmarshe.

20. At the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brompton, Henry Arnold, esq., to Helen Letitia, dau. of the late Capt. William Nugent Glascock, R.N.

— At Belgaum, Maitland, Lieut. W. B. Sabine Pasley, Bombay Art., son of Rear-Adm. Sir Thomas Sabine Pasley, bart., to Kate Henson, dau. of Major Grehan, late Seventy-eighth Highlanders.

— At the British Embassy, Brussels, Bentley Murray, esq., to Lucy Jane Eleanora, dau. of the late Sir John Wm. Pitt Muir Mackenzie, of Delvine and Casencarrrie, bart.

24. At Compton Church, near Guildford, Lieut.-Col. Elrington, Commanding Fourth Battalion Rifle Brigade, to Emilie Jane Best, dau. of George and Elizabeth Georgina Best, of Eastbury Manor House, Compton.

25. At Newchurch, Isle of Wight, Lieut. George Douglas Harris, H.M.'s Eighteenth Regt., to Mary Elizabeth Bennett, dau. of Capt. Henry B. Wyatt, R.N., of Ryde, Isle of Wight.

— At Dover, Capt. Rudolf F. J. Roerdansz, Royal Prussian Art., to Maria Catherine, dau. of the Rev. Randall Ward, M.A., late Archdeacon and Senior Chaplain at the Presidency of Bombay.

— At Myddleton Tyas, Yorkshire, the Rev. Henry William Bagnell, Chaplain to H.M.I.F. in the Bombay Presidency, to Emmerentia Charlotte, dau. of the late Nils William Alwroth, esq., Governor of the Royal Mint of Stockholm, Sweden.

26. At Lincoln, the Rev. T. J. Clarke, of Southport, to Frances Jane, dau. of the Rev. C. S. Bird, Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Hon. Cecil Duncombe, son of Lord Feversham, to Eleanor Jane, dau. of Charles Mills, esq., of Hillingdon Court, Middlesex.

MARRIAGES.

26. At Howth, Thomas Gaisford, esq., of Offington, Sussex, to the Lady Emily St. Lawrence.

27. At Barnes, Henry Davis, son of the late Sir Henry Willock, of Mortlake, to Mary Elizabeth, dau. of Major C. L. Boileau, of Castlenau, and late of the Rifle Brigade.

— At St. John's, Potter's Bar, Major Frederick Biscoe Tritton, Fifth Depôt Battalion, Parkhurst, to Selina Charlotte, dau. of Charles Marryat, esq., of Parkfield, Middlesex.

— At St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, the Hon. Mr. Irby, son of Lord Boston, to Augusta Caroline, dau. of Col. the Hon. John St. Vincent Saumarez, and niece to Lord de Saumarez.

— At Battersea Church, the Rev. Alfred Henry Locock, son of Sir Charles Locock, bart., to Anna Maria, dau. of the late Archdeacon Dealtry.

— At Darrington Church, Yorkshire, Lieut.-Col. Hay, late of the Carabineers, to Sophia, widow of the late William Verelst, esq., of Aston Hall, Yorkshire, and Grayingham, Lincolnshire.

29. At St. George's Church, Hanover-sq., Sir Benjamin C. C. Pine, M.A., Lieut.-Governor, Saint Kitts, to Margaretta Anne, dau. of the late Col. John Simpson, of the Bengal Army.

31. At Castle Forbes, John Stratford Kirwan, esq., of Moyne, Galway, to Lady Victoria Mary Louisa, dau. of George, second Marquis of Hastings, and sister of the present Peer.

NOVEMBER.

1. At Lower Heathcote Church, Thomas Frederick Peel, esq., second son of William Henry Peel, esq., of Aylesmole House, Gloucestershire, to Rhoda, widow of Edward Kent, esq., of Isis Farm, River Heathcote, New Zealand.

3. At St. John's Chapel, Edinburgh, Edward O. Douglas, esq., to Hannah Charlotte, dau. of the late Sir John Scott Douglas, bart.

— At Boxley, Kent, Francis Oliver Barker, esq., M.D., of H.M.'s Third (the Buffs) Regt., to Louisa Ann, dau. of James Espinasse, esq., of Boxley Lodge, Recorder of Rochester, and one of the Judges of the County Court of Kent.

5. At All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge, William Vernon Harcourt, esq., to Marie Thérèse Lister, dau. of the late

Thomas H. Lister and Lady Theresa Lewis.

8. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Edward Maxwell Brownlow, esq., to Charlotte Anne, dau. of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Lionel Smith, bart., G.C.B., G.C.H.

— At Amesbury, Cosmo Duff Gordon, esq., son of the late Sir William Duff Gordon, bart., to Anna Maria, dau. of Sir Edmund Antrobus, bart.

10. At All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge, Lucius Bentinck, Viscount Falkland, to Elizabeth Catherine, Duchess of St. Alban's.

— At Risby, Suffolk, Henry Gerard Hoare, esq., son of the Ven. C. J. Hoare, Archdeacon of Surrey, to Jane Frances, dau. of the Rev. S. H. Alderson.

— At the Catholic Chapel, Falmouth, Horatio Mary Augusta, dau. of Admiral Francis Temple, to M. Achilles Schmidt, of Naples.

— At All Souls' Church, Langham-place, Lieut.-Col. Sidney Burrard, Grenadier Guards, son of the late Rev. Sir George Burrard, bart., to Geraldine Augusta, dau. of W. J. Richardson, esq., of Oak Hall, Wanstead, Essex.

— At Aberdeen, David Owen Bateson, esq., of Liverpool, to Margaret, dau. of Sir Thomas Blaikie, of Kingseat, Aberdeenshire.

— At St. Leonard's-on-Sea, the Rev. John Marten Cripps, Rector of Great Yeldham, Essex, to Mary Ann, dau. of Sir Woodbine Parish, K.C.H.

15. At New York, Thomas Charles Baring, esq., M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, son of the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, to Susan Carter, dau. of Robert Browne Minturn, esq., of New York.

— At the Manse of Methlick, in Aberdeenshire, Lieut.-Col. Samuel Parr, to Catherine Anne, dau. of the Rev. James Whyte.

— At Norton, near Malton, Digby, son of Sir Digby Clayley, bart., of Brompton Hall, Yorkshire, to Charlotte Philadelphia, dau. of Robert Bower, esq., of Welham, near Malton.

17. At Bray Church, Theodore Waldron, esq., late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, to Charlotte Elliot, dau. of Riversdale W. Grenfell, esq., of Ray Lodge, Maidenhead.

— At Kenwyn, Truro, George Cayley, esq., to Margaret, dau. of the Ven. Archdeacon Paul, of Nelson, New Zealand.

MARRIAGES.

17. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Lord Bingham, eldest son of the Earl of Lucan, to Lady Cecilia Gordon Lennox, sixth dau. of his Grace the Duke of Richmond.

19. At St. Luke's, Chelsea, Capt. Gerard Napier, R.N., to Ella Louisa, dau. of Col. Sir J. M. Wilson, C.B., K.H., of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea.

22. At Fremington, North Devon, Capt. George Whitlock, esq., Eighty-fourth Regiment, son of Major-Gen. Sir Cornish Whitlock, K.C.B., to Laura, dau. of the late J. Vellacott, esq.

— At Stillorgan Church, near Dublin, Commr. G. H. Wale, R.N., son of the late Gen. Sir C. Wale, K.C.B., to Blanche, dau. of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin.

— At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Earl of Dalkeith, M.P., eldest son of the Duke of Buccleuch, to Lady Louisa Hamilton, dau. of the Marquis of Abercorn.

— At the Oratory, and also at Trinity Church, South Kennington, William Metcalfe, esq., of the Inner Temple, to Agnes, widow of Major Newall, and dau. of T. Vaughan, esq., co. Glasgow.

24. At Alderley, Thomas Henry Sherwood, of Twenty-first Royal North British Fusiliers, to Anne, dau. of Robert Blagden Hale, esq.

— At Gateshead, James Croudace, esq., of Bluehouse, Washington, to Isabella, dau. of James Laing, esq., of John's-place, Gateshead.

26. At St. Luke's, Chelsea, W. Leigh Clare, esq., of West Derby, to Frances Louisa, dau. of the late Gen. George Wright, Royal Engineers.

29. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., Sir Benjamin C. C. Pine, Lieut.-Gov. of St. Kitt's, to Margaretta Anna, dau. of the late Col. John Simpson of the Bengal Army.

5. At Auckland, New Zealand, the Hon. Edward William Stafford, of Mayne, co. Louth, First Minister of the Crown in New Zealand, to Mary, dau. of the Hon. Thomas Houghton Bartley, Speaker of the Legislative Council.

6. At Rockbarton, Limerick, Sir John Richard Wolseley, bart., of Mount Wolseley, Carlow, to Francis Annabella, dau. of the late Arthur Blennerhassett, esq., M.P.

— At the Cathedral, Antigua, the Hon. Bertie Entwistle Jarvis, of Mount Joshua, Member of H.M.'s Council of that island, to Martha Elliott, dau. of the late Lionel Oliver, esq., of Bristol.

— At Madras, Capt. C. Fitzroy, of the Sixty-eighth Light Inf., son of Lord C. Fitzroy, and Aide-de-Camp to the Governor of Madras, to Mary, dau. of L. Strange, esq., of the Sudder Court of Madras.

7. At Torquay, Charles Cramond Dick, esq., to Fanny Inglis, dau. of E. W. H. Schenley, esq.

8. At Bolton Percy Church, Yorkshire, Egerton Vernon Harcourt, esq., to Laura Milner, dau. of the late Sir William Milner, bart., of Nunappleton.

10. The Comte de Rancé, to Williamina Helen Stewart Forbes Leith, widow of Col. James John Forbes Leith, of Whitehaugh, and dau. of the late Col. James Stewart, of the Forty-second Royal Highland Regt.

— At Hampstead, Thomas Platt, esq., of Lincoln's Inn, to Emily Ann, dau. of the late Charles Phillips, esq., one of Her Majesty's Commissioners for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors.

13. At Wimpole, Cambridgeshire, Henry William Currie, esq., to Flora Caroline, dau. of the Hon. and Ven. Archdeacon Yorke.

— At Prospect Hall, near Dublin, George Henry Haigh, esq., of Grainsby Hall, Lincolnshire, to Emma Jane Adelaide, dau. of the late Sir Robert Way Harty, bart.

14. At Curzon Chapel, Curzon-st., Mayfair, the Right Hon. Lord Vernon, to Frances Maria Emma Boothby, dau. of the late Rev. Brooke Boothby and the Hon. Mrs. Boothby.

— At Creagh, co. Cork, Matthew Yeats, esq., of Kilmemora, co. Kildare, to Ann Grace Maria, dau. of the Ven. J. M. Trew, D.D., Rector of Creagh, and late Archdeacon of the Bahamas.

— At Cheltenham, Philip Reginald Cocks, of Stepple Hall, Salop, to Camilla,

DECEMBER.

1. At St. Luke's, Chelsea, Francis William Newdigate, esq., late Coldstream Guards, to Charlotte Elizabeth, dau. of General Sir Alexander and Lady Woodford.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, John George C. L. Newnam, esq., H.B.M.'s Consul at Amsterdam, to Louise Cornelia, dau. of the Rev. Henry Dudley Ryder, Canon of Lichfield.

MARRIAGES.

dau. of the late Rev. William Newton, Vicar of Old Cleeve, Somerset.

15. At Torquay, Captain Sir Henry Vere Huntley, R.N., to Caroline, dau. of the late Rev. Henry Drury, of Harrow.

— At Antony Church, Cornwall, George Soltau Symons, esq., of Chaddlewood, Devon, to the Hon. Adele Isabella Graves, dau. of Lord and Lady Graves.

— At Walcot Church, Bath, the Rev. Joseph Abbott, Vicar of Corsham, Wilts, to Selina Matilda Caroline, dau. of the late Sir John E. Eardley Wilmot, bart., and widow of Wade Browne, esq., of Monckton Farleigh House, Wilts.

— At Madras, Capt. William H. Whitlock, Fifth Madras Native Inf., son of Maj.-Gen. Sir Geo. Whitlock, K.C.B., to Margaret Louisa, dau. of Lieut.-Col. Edward Lawford, Madras Eng.

— At Grenada, John Richard Walcott, esq., proprietor of the Black Bay Estate, to Aline, dau. of the Hon. Thomas Bell, President of Her Majesty's Council of Dominica.

— At the Church Mission Station, Tawhanga, New Zealand, the Rev. J. Kinder, M.A., to Marianne Celia, dau. of the Ven. Archdeacon A. N. Brown.

17. At All Saints' Church, Ennismore-place, Oscar W. Hambrough, esq., of Pipewell Hall, Northamptonshire, son of John Hambrough, esq., of Steephill Castle, Isle of Wight, to the Hon. Caroline Mary, only dau. of the late, and sister of the present, Viscount Hood.

20. At Kensington, Michael Hughes, esq., to Ellinor Mary, dau. of the late Rear-Admiral Colin Campbell, of Ardpatrick, Argyleshire.

22. At Elgin, Scotland, George Wilson, esq., Light Infantry, to Maria Mulgrave, dau. of the Hon. John Salmon, President of the Legislative Council of Jamaica.

— At St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Charles Thomas Longley, esq., H.M.'s Madras C.S., to Emmeline Frances, dau. of J. Howard F. Lloyd, esq., of Roseau, Dominica.

— At Trinity Church, Allahabad, Lieut.-Col. Wm. G. Le Mesurier, C.B., Royal Artillery, to Emilia Ramsay, dau. of the late Capt. Thomas Masson, Royal Artillery.

27. At Hampton, the Rev. William G. Austin, M.A., son of the Bishop of Guiana, to Mary Emily Gray, dau. of the late William Thomas Smyth, esq.

— At Eastbourne, Charles Brodie Locock, esq., M.A., son of Sir Charles Locock, bart., to Fanny Bird, dau. of

the Rev. Thomas Pitman, Vicar of Eastbourne.

30. At Edinburgh, Edward Augustus Prinsep, esq., of H.M.'s Indian C.S., Punjab, to Margaretta Eleanor, dau. of the late James Hunter, esq., of Thurston, N.B.

31. At St. George's, Hanover-sq., the Hon. Geoffrey Browne, only son of Lord Oranmore, to Christina, dau. of the late Alexander Guthrie, esq., of the Mount, Ayrshire.

DEATHS.

1859.

June. In the hospital at Brescia, the Duke of Abrantes, son of Marshal Junot. The Duke, who served on the divisional staff of the army of Italy, was struck down at the battle of Solferino, and died after amputation of the thigh.

July 4. At his residence, Winckley-sq., Preston, aged 68, John Addison, esq., Judge of the County Courts, North Lancashire Circuit. The deceased was a magistrate of the county of Lancaster, and of the borough of Preston, of which town he had been twice mayor, and was called to the bar in February, 1818. On the death of his father, who was an attorney in that place, he was appointed Recorder of Clitheroe, and he also acted as assessor to the Sheriffs of Lancashire. When the establishment of County Courts took place in March, 1847, Mr. Addison was appointed by the Lord Chancellor to be Judge of No. 4 Circuit.

Dec. 1. In St. James's-palace, aged 90, Sir Robert Alexander, bart.

June 5. At St. Andrew's, Dr. Andrew Alexander, Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrew's.

Jan. 20. At Cork-street, Burlington-gardens, aged 76, Henry Alexander, esq., surgeon-oculist to Her Majesty.

Sept. At Edinburgh, aged 69, Dr. William Pulteney Alison, late Professor of the Practice of Physic in the University of Edinburgh. The deceased, who was born in 1790, was the son of the Rev. Archibald Alison; an Episcopal clergyman in Edinburgh, who about the end of last century obtained a considerable literary reputation by the publication of his *Essays on Taste*, and the brother of Sir Archibald Alison the historian. Dr. W. P. Alison,

DEATHS.

who had while yet a young man shown the highest talent in and devotion to his profession as a medical practitioner, was, as early as 1820, chosen by the Edinburgh Town-council to fill the chair of Medical Jurisprudence in the University there, and was successively promoted to chairs of still higher importance, until in 1842 he was appointed Professor of the Practice of Physic. This chair he held till 1855, when he resigned, owing to ill health. The deceased was not only for many years one of the heads of the medical profession at Edinburgh, and gained for himself a wide reputation by the publication of various works, but he was still better known in his own immediate sphere by his unbounded benevolence and philanthropy. Such was the estimation in which the deceased was held by his fellow-townsmen that he was honoured with a public funeral, attended by the City authorities, the University Professors, and the Members of the Medical Societies and of the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

April 1. At the Chantry, Bradford-on-Avon, Lieut.-Col. James Allen, late of the H.E.I.C.S.

June 13. At his residence, Champion-park, Camberwell, Surrey, aged 64, Henry Alsager, esq.

April 16. At St. James's-sq., Bath, Capt. Wm. Proctor Anderdon, late of the H.E.I.C.S. He was descended from a family connected with Bath and Bridgewater for the last two centuries. He entered the service of the East India Company as a cadet, in the year 1796. He served through all the campaigns of Lord Lake, and was wounded in the trenches before Agra by a musket-shot in the shoulder. In 1808, being considered one of the most intelligent, active, and able officers in the Bengal Army, he was selected for the command of one of the Light Inf. Battalions, which were then first embodied for the purpose of instruction and exercise on the plains of Cawnpore, after the model of the camp at Shorncliffe, in 1802, under Sir John Moore.

March 28. At Southampton, aged 60, Richard Andrews, esq., Alderman of Southampton. The deceased was born in a humble village of Hampshire, in 1798. The first years of his life were passed in obscurity and poverty, working as a farm lad at 3d. a-day, from nine to twelve years of age; then getting employ as a sawyer, next as a blacksmith, but always with aspirations for

something better. In 1821 he came to Southampton with half-a-crown in his pocket (the sum total of his earthly property), and got work as a journeyman coachmaker in Mr. Jones's factory, where he was employed for seven years; when, with the money saved during that period from his wages, he started in business in a humble way on his own account. From that time his course was onward and upward, by his indomitable energy, integrity, and industry, carving out for himself a position of wealth and honour as a tradesman and a name and reputation for public spirit which will long survive him. He successively served the offices of Town-Councillor, Alderman, Sheriff, Mayor (five times), and Magistrate of the borough. Though almost without education, he was a man of a singular shrewdness that enabled him to play a respectable part in any situation in which he chanced to be placed; and the radical coachmaker of Southampton became even a political character of some consequence.

Sept. 29. At Leamington, aged 60, James Annesley, esq., Her Majesty's Consul at Amsterdam, son of the Hon. Robert Annesley, and grandson of Richard, second Earl of Annesley.

Jan. 14. At Deyrah Dhoon, from fatigue and exposure during the late mutiny, Brev.-Maj. Octavius Henry St. George Anson, son of the late General Sir George Anson, G.C.B. The deceased officer served with the Ninth Lancers in the battle of Punniar, for which he received a medal; the campaign on the Sutlej in 1846, including the battle of Sobraon, for which he received a medal; he was also in the Punjaub campaign of 1848-49, including the passage of the Chenab at Ramnuggur and battles of Chillianwallah and Goojerat, for which he received a medal and clasps. He had served throughout the Punjaub and Gwalior campaign, and against the revolted Sepoys from the siege of Delhi to the fall of Lucknow.

May 16. Of yellow fever, after a very brief tenure of his sacred office, the Right Rev. S. Jordan Rigaud, D.D., F.R.A.S., Lord Bishop of Antigua, and Member of the Executive Council of that Island.

Dr. Rigaud was the son of the late Stephen Peter Rigaud, M.A., Radcliffe Observer at Oxford from 1827 to 1839. In Michaelmas Term, 1838, he gained the highest honours of his University, a first class both in Classics and Mathematics. After having been for some time Fellow

DEATHS.

and Tutor of Exeter, where he obtained considerable reputation for his success with his pupils, he became head master's assistant at Westminster School, whence he was transferred to the head mastership of Queen Elizabeth's School, Ipswich. This school was in but little reputation when Mr. Rigaud took it. His exertions so increased its efficiency that it became necessary to build a new school. Dr. Rigaud, who had a year or two before taken the degree of D.D., and had been Examiner in 1845 at Oxford, and Select Preacher before the University in Michaelmas Term, 1856, was nominated in 1857, by the Right Hon. H. Labouchere, M.P., then Secretary for the Colonies, to the bishopric of Antigua, with a stipend of 2000*l.* a year; and the clergy, gentry, and people of Ipswich on that occasion presented him with a splendid testimonial, indicative of their sense of his merits in promoting every educational, philanthropic, and religious improvement in their town. In Antigua his career was short, but sufficiently long to mark him as an ornament to the episcopate; for his activity, cheerful disposition, and deep piety impressed his flock so thoroughly, that he was honoured with a public funeral, the Lieutenant-Governor heading it, and hundreds of people following it.

Aug. 6. At Sutton Scarsdale, Derbyshire, Robert Arkwright, esq., aged 76; a Magistrate and Deputy Lieutenant of Derbyshire, and High Sheriff in 1850.

Mr. Arkwright was the eldest surviving son of the late Richard Arkwright, esq., of Willersley, and grandson of Sir Richard Arkwright, the inventor of the "Spinning Jenny." He married Frances, daughter of the late Stephen Kemble, esq., by whom he has left issue. He had inherited the mechanical skill and business tact of his predecessors in the family, and his everyday transactions were characterized by the strictest precision and accuracy. He was exceedingly methodical in all matters of business, however trivial, and everything of note passed under his own recognition. Possessed of great wealth, he was most liberal to those of his tenantry who required his aid or assistance, but he would always fully and thoroughly satisfy himself that his aid was required before he bestowed it. He was of a highly intelligent and independent turn of mind, his decisions were characterized by sound judgment and undeviating firmness of purpose, and his ideas were communicated in language

plain and unmistakable. As a cultivator of land on the improved system few could excel him, as a landlord he was highly esteemed, and in this relation of life he carried out that rigid system of order and regularity in business, which was apparent in all his other transactions. He took great interest in the improvement of the Sutton estate, and expended nearly the whole of the annual rental towards that object. His three eldest sons having pre-deceased him, he is succeeded in his large estates by a youthful grandson, the child of his second son.

April 9. At Gibraltar, on his passage home from India, aged 31, William Delafield Arnold, Director of Public Instruction in the Punjab, fourth son of the late Dr. Arnold, of Rugby.

May 5. At Aston-hall, near Runcorn, Cheshire, aged 61, Sir Arthur Ingram Aston, K.C.B.; son of the late Col. Henry Hervey Aston, by the fourth daughter and co-heir of the last Viscount Irvine; and great-grandson of the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Henry Hervey, who assumed the name of Aston, and was the fifth son of the first Earl of Bristol. In 1817, the deceased was attached to the Embassy at Vienna, and was made Secretary of Legation at Rio de Janeiro in April, 1826. In January, 1833, he was appointed Secretary of Embassy at Paris, and was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Madrid from February, 1840, to November, 1842. He received the Order of the Bath on returning to England.

May 5. At Weston-super-Mare, whither he had gone to place one of his sons at school, Edwin Martin Atkins, esq., of Kingston Lisle, near Wantage, aged 51, a Deputy-Lieutenant for the County of Berks, Chairman of the Wantage Bench of Magistrates, and High Sheriff of Berkshire in the year 1844. Mr. Atkins was a fine specimen of a squire of old family, residing at his ancient family mansion. While he kept up the hospitality proper to an "Old" English gentleman, and indulged in the sports of the field, he possessed the refinements of the modern school, was educated at Rugby and Oxial, possessed considerable skill in the arts, and was an enthusiastic antiquary. The famous "Blowing Stone" was his property, and the "White Horse" was not far off. Of this memorial of Saxon times Mr. Atkins was a kind of guardian, and the jovial festival of the "Scouring of the White Horse," by which the figure was cleansed of the

DEATHS.

grass, and weeds, and other impurities by which it was becoming obscured, was set on foot by him and conducted with great spirit.

July 23. At his residence, Kippington, Sevenoaks, aged 84, Col. Thomas Austen, M.P. for West Kent, 1845.

Jan. 3. At Packington-hall, Warwickshire, aged 72, Heneage, fifth Earl of Aylesford. His lordship was born April 24, 1786, and succeeded to the honours as fifth earl on the death of his father in 1812. He married, in 1821, Lady Augusta Greville, daughter of George, Earl of Brooke and Warwick, and has left issue. The late earl was formerly Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, and filled the office of Lord Steward of Her Majesty's Household. He was a trustee of Rugby School, and F.S.A.

April 15. At Edinburgh, Jane Emily Wilson, wife of William Edmondstone Aytoun, esq., Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Edinburgh.

July 14. At his residence, Bathwick-hill, near Bath, aged 82, John Bacon, esq., F.S.A., formerly of Sidcliffe, near Eddimouth, eldest son of the late John Bacon, R.A., sculptor.

April 15. In Eccleston-sq., Caroline Rachel Baillie, eldest daughter of the Lord Advocate for Scotland, M.P.

Nov. 2. At Dunstable-house, Richmond, aged 72, Vice-Adm. Sir Henry Loraine Baker, bart., C.B. He assisted at the storming of Sumana (St. Domingo), in 1827, and was promoted for his conduct at the defence of Anholt in 1811. He served with considerable distinction at Guadaloupe in 1815.

Dec. 24. In his 66th year, Mr. Robert Baker, of Writtle, the father of the Protection Societies, and one of the most celebrated of our agriculturists. Himself a tenant farmer, Mr. Baker was ever ready to stand up for the rights and everything calculated to promote the prosperity of the class to which he belonged; while his sound judgment and integrity secured for him the confidence of all classes connected with the land. His life was one long career of usefulness, great ability, and increasing energy, employed from the first in doing everything to advance that interest with which he had become so signally identified. For a long series of years the results of his study and experience might be traced through the columns of our agricultural publications, as one of the safest of our pioneers to the improved system of husbandry, as one

who thoroughly knew all he taught. Mr. Baker long took a leading part in the proceedings of the London Farmers' Club, of which he was one of the founders; but latterly ill-health had prevented his giving active attention to public or practical affairs.

April 13. In Paris, aged 69, Charles Barry Baldwin, esq., formerly M.P. for Totnes.

Nov. 26. At Florence, aged 91, C. Bankhead, esq., formerly Physician Extraordinary to his Majesty King George IV.

May 19. At Dungannon, Ireland, aged 40, Sir Robert Barclay, bart.

Feb. 16. At her residence, Brook-st., Bath, aged 86, Harriet Alicia, relict of Sir R. Barclay, bart.

Aug. 19. At Christ Church, Oxford, aged 88, the Rev. Frederick Barnes, D.D., Vicar of Colyton-cum-Shute and Monkton, and Senior Canon of Christ Church.

Aug. 15. At Upper Holloway, aged 75, Mr. Josiah Bartlett, for 36 years resident in the house of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Earl-st., and in the service of the Society for nearly 50 years.

Aug. 20. At Southam-villa, Leamington, aged 70, Miss Anne Bateson, eldest sister of Sir Robert Bateson, bart., of Castruce.

April 12. At Dawlish, aged 69, Major O'Hara Baynes, R.N., Roy. Art.

April 2. At Indore, Lieut.-Col. Charles Grant Becher, of the Fifth Bengal Light Cav., and of Beaton's Horse.

April 8. At his residence, Stanhope-st., Park-pl., Regent's-park, aged 74, Joseph Beioley, esq., formerly a Chief Factor of the Hon. Hudson's Bay Company, and late a Governor of the Royal Hospitals of London.

June 12. At Tunbridge Wells, aged 49, Jacob Bell, of Langham-pl. and Oxford-st.

Jacob Bell was the head of the famous firm of dispensing chemists, the excellence of whose drugs have given them an European reputation. Mr. Bell was himself an ardent and indefatigable student in chemical and in other sciences. He died of hard work. In the full expectation of death, and in spite of a most painful malady, he could not desist from his labours, and in a half-fainting state was buckled up to his work till within an hour before he breathed his last. He spent a fortune in starting and in advancing the Pharmaceutical Society, which

DEATHS.

bids fair to embrace before long all the chemists and druggists of Great Britain, and which, in the meantime, has raised enormously the educational standard of the class. He was the President of the Society; and it is some proof of the estimation in which he was held, not only in his profession, but throughout the district where he resided, that, on the day of his funeral, there was scarcely a town in the kingdom in which some "pharmaceutical chemist" had not his shutters closed to mark the event. He was a man of the most unselfish nature, who devoted himself to public objects, who toiled like a galley-slave for other people, and who won the affection of all who knew him. It is well known that, subsidiary to the professional views which were the absorbing object of his life, Mr. Jacob Bell was a most generous patron of the arts, and had collected in his house at Langham-place a very valuable gallery of pictures, many of them from the easel of his friend Sir Edwin Landseer. With the same unselfishness which characterized his public life, he has bequeathed the best of his pictures to the nation. Among them, there are of Landseer's—"The Maid and the Magpie," the celebrated picture of the "Shoeing," "The Sleeping Bloodhound," "Alexander and Diogenes," "Dignity and Impudence," and the "Defeat of Comus." There are beside, "The Sacking of a Jew's House," by Charles Landseer; two fine landscapes by Lee and Sidney Cooper; O'Neill's picture of "The Foundling Examined by the Board of Guardians;" one of Ward's best historical works, "James II. Receiving the News of the Landing of the Prince of Orange;" the popular "Derby-day" of Mr. Frith; and, to crown all, there is the "Horse Fair" of Rosa Bonheur—not the large picture, but a smaller original, painted at the same time, and the work from which the engraving is taken. There are in all thirteen fine pictures of English masters, and one of Frank Stone's, not finished.

Jan. 26. At Fan House, Wivelsfield, aged 70, Thomas Jones Bellamy, esq., for many years an active magistrate for the county of Sussex.

March 16. In the Close, Salisbury, Mr. Bennett, proprietor of the *Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, a much-respected magistrate of the former city.

April 7. At Shrivensham Vicarage, aged 81, the Ven. Archdeacon Berens.

Oct. 3. In Lower Leeson-st., Dublin,

aged 76, James Bessonett, esq., Q.C., Chairman of Sessions for the county of Waterford.

April 18. At the Palace, Bangor, aged 86, the Right Rev. Christopher Bethell, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor. The deceased prelate was born in 1773. He was the son of the Rev. Richard Bethell, and was born at Isleworth. He was educated at King's College, Cambridge, of which foundation he was elected a Fellow, and became second Members' prizeman. In 1824, he was nominated by Lord Liverpool, the then Prime Minister, to the bishopric of Gloucester. In 1830, the Duke of Wellington, the then Prime Minister, transferred him to the more lucrative see of Exeter, and again in the same year to the still more lucrative see of Bangor, which he held up to the time of his death. His lordship was the author of several theological works, the principal of which is his "General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism," which has become a standard work among High Churchmen. Dr. Bethell was a very distinguished scholar, and was, during the whole of his life, identified with the theological views of the High Church party, which he consistently defended in his speeches and his various writings.

Sept. 26. Aged 79, the Rev. Frederick Stephen Bevan, rector of Carleton Rode, Norfolk, Honorary Canon of Norwich, and Rural Dean.

Sept. 2. At Christ Church Parsonage, Hampstead, aged 71, Sarah, widow of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, rector of Watton, Herts.

Feb. 3. Lieut.-Col. John Lewis Black, late of the Fifty-third Regt. of Foot. He served in the Peninsular campaign of 1815, including the battles of Quatre Bras and Waterloo, at which last he was slightly wounded. He served also in the campaign on the Sutlej, for which he received a medal. Also in the battles of Buddiwal, Aliwal, and Sebraon.

Aug. 7. In Portman-st., London, the Dowager Lady Blackett, relict of Sir W. Blackett, bart., of Matfen, Northumberland.

Aug. 3. At Caldwell, Ayrshire, the seat of her son-in-law, Col. Muir, after a few hours' illness, Elizabeth, widow of Sir David Hunter Blair, bart., of Blairquhan, second daughter of Sir John Hay, bart.

June 19. At Grove House, Hampton, Middlesex, aged 70, Major.-Gen. Thomas Blanchard, C.B., R.E.

DEATHS.

Dec. 25. At Barnfield House, Southampton, aged 90, General Richard Blunt, Col. of the Sixty-sixth Regt., a retired Lieut.-Gen. in the Portuguese Army, Knight of the Tower and Sword, &c.

May 28. At Freetown, Sierra Leone, of yellow fever, the Right Rev. Dr. J. Bowen, Bishop of Sierra Leone, the third prelate of that see since its establishment in 1852. Dr. Bowen was for some years engaged in farming in Canada, and served in the militia during the rebellion. Coming to this country in 1842, he entered as a student of Trinity College, Dublin. He was ordained by the present Bishop of Durham. In 1847 he went to Palestine and the East, and returned to England in 1851. Afterwards he visited Nineveh, where he formed the acquaintance of Mr. Layard, with whom he was associated during many of his investigations. He visited the East a second time in 1854, and came back to England again in 1856. In 1853 he was presented by the Marquess of Huntley to the rectory of Orton Longueville. The parish having but a small population, he obtained without difficulty a licence for non-residence, in order that he might indulge in his Eastern travels. This living he held up to the time he was appointed to the bishopric of Sierra Leone, to which he was consecrated in the chapel of Lambeth Palace on the 28th of Sept. 1857, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was assisted by the Bishop of Peterborough and the Bishop of Victoria, who was at that time in England. On the 13th Dec., 1857, Bishop Bowen arrived at Sierra Leone, and on the 28th of May, 1859, he died in consequence of a malignant attack of yellow fever. His tenure of the episcopate was somewhat longer than that of either of his two predecessors; and these missionary prelates may truly be said to have died martyrs to the cause of religious duty.

April 5. In London, Ellen Amelia, wife of Sir S. Geo. Bonham, bart., K.C.B.

Jan. 14. At Brush House, Ecclesfield, aged 80, John Kaye Booth, M.D., J.P., for the West Riding, late Principal of Queen's College, Birmingham.

April 12. At St. Petersburg, Madame Bosio, a young lady whose progressive excellence gave promise of the highest eminence as a dramatic singer. Her funeral was attended by thousands of the *élite* of the Russian capital and—a singular, but not unprecedented honour in that military empire—by a splendid military

escort. The young actress had been engaged to take leading parts in the opera in London during the season, and she was expected to arrive in a few days. Her sudden decease was much lamented by a large circle of admirers in London; for her private character was as estimable as her vocal and dramatic powers were admirable.

Feb. 12. At Buxton Vicarage, Norfolk, aged 79, Lieut.-General James Claud Bourchier, K.C., Colonel of the 3rd Dragoon Guards. In the early part of his military career he was actively engaged, having been under Sir R. Abercromby in the campaign in Egypt of 1801, in the Peninsular campaigns of 1811 and 1812, including the siege of Badajoz, battle of Salamanca, and several minor cavalry affairs, and the great actions in Belgium in 1815. The gallant officer was appointed Col. of the Third Dragoon Guards in 1851, and became a Lieut.-General in 1854.

Feb. 17. At Canterbury, near Sydney, New South Wales, aged 32, Sarah Mary, widow of Wm. Hobart Seymour, esq., and subsequently wife of Henry Pleydell Bouverie, esq.

Oct. 8. At Southampton, aged 70, Rear-Admiral Wm. Bohun Bowyer.

Feb. 11. At his residence, Rue Faubourg St. Honoré, Paris, Rear-Admiral Courtenay Boyle.

Dec. 3. At Montpellier Villas, Brighton, aged 70, of bronchitis, Colonel Edward William Bray, C.B., late of H.M. Thirtieth (Dorsetshire) Regt., which he commanded at the battle of Maharajpore.

Jan. 9. At Castle Bromwich, aged 64, Solomon Bray, esq., late Town Clerk of Birmingham, a gentleman universally respected in his private and public character.

Sept. 17. At Ryde, Isle of Wight, aged 77, Vice-Admiral John Brenton. The deceased admiral served throughout the French war under Saumarez, Collingwood, St. Vincent, Codrington, &c. He was mate of the *Cæsar* in the actions fought off Algeiras and in the Straits in 1801, and was Acting-Commander in charge of a division of gunboats at the defence of Riga, and in an expedition against Mittau, in 1812.

Feb. 13. On board the *Eastern Monarch*, at sea, aged 38, Brevet-Maj. Reginald Best Brett, of the Bombay Artillery, and the late Turkish Contingent. He was a subaltern of Leslie's troop of Horse Artillery through Gen. Nott's campaign, and at Dacca under Sir Charles

DEATHS.

Napier, and served with the Turkish Contingent through the Crimean campaign.

Jan. 10. At Dover, John Bridge, esq., aged 76.

Feb. 6. At Beddington House, Surrey, Frances, wife of Sir Henry Bridges.

Feb. 15. At his house in St. James's Square, Frederick William Hervey, Marquis and Earl of Bristol, Earl Jermyn of Horninghurst, Suffolk, and Baron Hervey of Ickworth, Suffolk, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, son of Frederick fourth earl of Bristol (Bishop of Derry) by his wife Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Jermyn Davers. The venerable Peer was born on the 2nd of October, 1769, and was consequently in the 90th year of his age, and was the oldest member of the House of Lords.

The late Marquis, previous to his succeeding to the family honours, represented Bury St. Edmunds in the House of Commons from 1796 to July, 1803. He was Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when Lord Hawkesbury (afterwards Earl of Liverpool) was Secretary of State, from February, 1801, till November, 1803. On the death of his father in July, 1803, he succeeded to the earldom of Bristol, and in June, 1826, was created Marquis of Bristol. The deceased Marquis was hereditary Steward of Bury St. Edmunds; a Governor of King's College; a Fellow of the Royal Society, and of the Society of Antiquaries. His Lordship married, 20th February, 1798, the hon. Elizabeth Albana Upton, second daughter of Clotworthy, first Viscount Templeton, by whom (who died in 1844) he leaves issue.

Feb. 27. William John Broderip, esq., formerly a Metropolitan Police Magistrate, F.L.S., F.G.S., F.R.S. Mr. Broderip was a native of Bristol, where his father was an eminent medical practitioner. He was a member of Oriel College, Oxford; and was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, in 1817. By his able editing of some volumes of law reports and other works, he attained reputation, and was selected by Sir R. Peel for one of the metropolitan magistrates; the duties of this office he ably fulfilled for thirty-four years; when, finding that he was losing his hearing, he resigned.

Apart from his profession, in which he was ever diligent, Mr. Broderip's studies were directed to natural history, and he was especially eminent in the science of zoology. He was one of the founders of the Zoological Club, of the Zoological Society,

of the *Zoological Journal*, and of the Zoological Gardens. He wrote numerous papers in the Society's Transactions, undertook the department of Zoology in the "Penny Cyclopædia;" and contributed some excellent articles to the *Quarterly Review*, on subjects connected with natural history.

March 1. At Horningsheath, Suffolk, aged 86, Arthur John Brooke, esq., High Sheriff of the county of Suffolk, in the year 1839.

Jan. 15. At his residence, Onslow-square, aged 86, Gen. R. S. Brough, R. A., and 65th year of his service.

May 16. At Parkstone, Poole, aged 49, Eliz. Patience, wife of Vice-Adm. Philip Browne (the senior Vice-Admiral).

March 30. At Godlington Bury, Bedfordshire, by a fall from his horse, William Kenworthy Browne, late Capt. in the Bedfordshire Militia, and a justice of the peace.

June. Aged 90, the widow of Admiral Bruyès, who was blown up in his flag-ship *L'Orient*, at the battle of the Nile.

Sept. 15. At his residence, Duke-street, Westminster, aged 54, Isambard Kingdom Brunel, one of the two greatest engineers of the age; constructor of the Thames Tunnel (under his father); of the Great Western Railway, with its numerous branches, bridges, viaducts, and tunnels; of the South Devon and Cornwall Railway, with its stupendous Albert Bridge over the Tamar; of the *Great Western*, of the *Great Britain*, and of the *Great Eastern* steamships; of Hungerford Suspension Bridge, and of numerous other stupendous works of engineering and constructive skill. Mr. Brunel was also the advocate of "the broad-gauge," and of the principle of combined suspension and tension in the construction of bridges. Mr. Brunel, the son of Sir Isambard Mark Brunel, was born in 1806, at Portsmouth, where his father was engaged in constructing the celebrated block-machinery. The bent of his mind when young was clearly seen by his father and by all who knew him. His education was therefore directed to qualify him for that profession in which he afterwards distinguished himself. His father was his first, and, perhaps, his best tutor. When he was about fourteen he was sent to Paris, where he was placed under the care of M. Masson, previous to entering the college of Henri Quatre, where he remained two years. He then returned to England, and it may

DEATHS.

be said that, in fact, he then commenced his professional career under his father, in which he rendered him important assistance—devoting himself from that time forward to his profession exclusively and ardently. He displayed even then the resources, not only of a trained and educated mind, but great original and inventive power. He possessed the advantage of being able to express or draw clearly and accurately whatever he had matured in his own mind. But not only that; he could work out with his own hands, if he pleased, the models of his own designs whether in wood or iron. As a mere workman he would have excelled. Even at this early period steam navigation may be said to have occupied his mind, for he made the model of a boat, and worked it with locomotive contrivances of his own. Everything he did, he did with all his might and strength, and he did it well. The same energy, thoughtfulness, and accuracy, the same thorough conception and mastery of whatever he undertook, distinguished him in all minor things, whether working as a tyro in his father's office, or as the engineer of the Great Western Railway Company, or, later, in the conception and design in all its details of the *Great Eastern* steamship. Soon after his return to England, his father was occupied, among other things, with plans for the formation of a tunnel under the Thames. In 1825 this work was commenced, and Brunel took an active part in the work under his father. As is well known that great work was several times interrupted by the in-break of the river. The ingenious contrivances and arduous labours by which those disasters were remedied were due to young Brunel. When that work was stopped in 1848 he undertook some large works on his own responsibility, constructing large docks at Sunderland and Bristol, and some extensive tramways in the mining districts. By these works his mind was directed to the study of railway engineering. This science was in its infancy, and practically unknown, when he was appointed engineer of the Great Western Railway. Whatever may be the wisdom of its plan in a commercial point of view, there is little room for doubt that it is one of the greatest works of its kind. Many of its structures—such as the viaduct at Hanwell; the Maidenhead-bridge, which has the flattest arch of such large dimensions ever attempted in brickwork; the Box tunnel, which, at the date of its construction,

was the longest in the world; and the bridges and tunnels between Bath and Bristol,—deserve the attention of the professional student. They are all more or less remarkable and original works.

On the South Devon and Cornish railways there are also works of great magnitude and importance. The sea-wall of the South Devon Railway, and, above all, the Albert-bridge over the Tamar, deserve to be specially mentioned, together with the bridge over the Wye at Chepstow, as works which do honour to the genius of the engineer and the country too. On the South Devon Railway he adopted the plan which had been previously tried on the London and Croydon line,—viz. of propelling the carriages by atmospheric pressure. This plan failed; but he entertained a strong opinion that this power would be found hereafter capable of adoption for locomotive purposes. It is impossible, in such a rapid sketch as this of his energetic and professional life, to do more than notice, or rather catalogue, his works. It was in connection with the interests of the Great Western Railway that he first conceived the idea of building a steamship especially adapted to run between England and America. The *Great Western* was built accordingly. The power, and tonnage of this vessel was about double that of the largest ship afloat at the time of her construction. Subsequently, the *Great Britain*, the first of the great screw steamers, and more than double the tonnage of the *Great Western*, was designed and built under Mr. Brunel's superintendence. Mr. Brunel was the first of the great engineers to recognize the value of the screw propeller, and conferred upon the country the great service of prevailing upon the Government to introduce it into the navy. The first fighting ship fitted with the screw was the *Rattler* sloop of war—now the whole sailing fleet has been discarded, and the British navy reconstructed. Thus prepared by experience and much personal devotion to the subject of steam navigation by means of large ships, Mr. Brunel, in the latter part of 1851 and the beginning of 1852, begun to work out the idea he had long entertained—that to make long voyages economically and speedily by steam required that the vessels should be large enough to carry the coal for the entire voyage outwards, and, unless the facilities for obtaining coal were very great at the outport, then for the return voyage also; and that ves-

DEATHS.

sels much larger than any then built could be navigated with great advantages from the mere effects of size. Hence originated the *Great Eastern*. All the circumstances attending the construction, the launching, the trial of this great ship have been so recently given in the volumes of the ANNUAL REGISTER that it is unnecessary to repeat them.

In his private character Mr. Brunel was singularly amiable and cheerful. As a professional man the same frank kindness of heart prevailed. He seemed actuated by no professional jealousy. His advice and assistance were frankly at the command of his rivals when any great undertaking seemed at a stand; and he was a steady patron of those who had been his pupils or *employés*, who confidently looked up to him as a patron.

The death of Mr. Brunel was hastened by the fatigue and mental strain caused by his efforts to superintend the completion of the *Great Eastern*, and in these efforts his last days were spent. But we must not forbear to mention that for several years past Mr. Brunel had been suffering from ill-health brought on by over exertion. Nevertheless he allowed himself no relaxation from his professional labours, and it was during the period of bodily pain and weakness that his greatest difficulties were surmounted and some of his greatest works achieved. Possessing a mind strong in the consciousness of rectitude, he pursued, in single-hearted truthfulness, what he believed to be the course of duty, and in his love of and devotion to his profession he accomplished, both at home and abroad, on the Continent and in India, works the history of which will be the best monument to his memory. With an intellect singularly powerful and acute, for nothing escaped his observation in any branch of science which could be made available in his own pursuits, yet it was accompanied by humility and a kindness of heart which endeared him to all who knew him and enjoyed his friendship. The very boldness and originality of his works, of which he was never known to boast, while it added to his fame, added no little to his anxiety, and not unfrequently encompassed him with difficulty—

“Great was the glory, greater was the strife,”

which told ultimately upon his health and strength, and finally closed his life when he was little more than 53 years of age.

The commercial success of Mr. Brunel's great undertakings was not answerable to the greatness of their conception. “Success and failure were his right hand and his left—success in the line of inventive art, failure in the results of reproductive art. Unlike Stephenson, who made everything pay, Brunel made nothing pay. As an engineer he raised the mightiest works, and ruined the richest men. The *Great Western Railway* and the *Great Eastern steam-ship*—the best line of railway in the world, and the noblest steam-ship afloat—both the most glorious growths of a scientific intellect—have had the same melancholy result of swamping the fortunes of all who invested in them. The engineer won renown, and the shareholders lost their money.” Mr. Brunel was a member of the Royal Society, having been elected at the early age of 26. In 1857 he was admitted by the University of Oxford to the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Laws, a distinction of which he was justly proud.

March 20. At Duke-st., Bath, aged 70, Eleanor, wife of the Rev. Charles Bryan, Rector of Woolstone, Gloucestershire, and only daughter of the late Admiral Kempthorne, of Helston, Cornwall.

May 22. At Newcastle, in his 78th year, John Bulman, esq., one of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the borough of Newcastle.

Jan. 27. At Dublin, the Dowager Lady Burke, widow of Col. Sir John Burke, bart., and daughter of the late Rt. Hon. Sir John Calcraft.

May 8. At the Free Church Manse, of Kilsyth, aged 80, the Rev. W. H. Burnes, D.D., in the fifty-ninth year of his ministry, senior minister of the Free Church of Scotland.

Dec. 28. At Edinburgh, in her 51st year, the Marchioness of Bute. Her ladyship was the second daughter of the first Marquess of Hastings; married John, second Marquess of Bute, 1845. In less than three years her ladyship was left a widow, with one child, John Patrick, the present Marquess, born Sept. 12, 1847.

October. At Sorrento, near Naples, aged 69, Lady Eleanor Butler, youngest daughter of John, seventeenth Earl of Ormonde.

Aug. 22. At Chichester, aged 76, Maria, wife of Sir W. Burnes, M.D., K.C.B., &c.

April 2. At her residence, Hammer-smith, Sophia Letitia, youngest daughter

of the late Sir George Strickland, bart., of Boynton House, Yorkshire, and widow of Capt. Calder, 21st Light Dragoons.

April 3. At Campden-grove, Kensington, aged 60, Maria Hutchins, daughter of the late Dr. Calcott.

Feb. 22. In Cavendish-sq., aged 92, the Hon. Frances Calvert.

January 4. At Hampden House, Bucks, aged 63, Donald Cameron, esq., Chief of the Camerons, and usually known by his territorial designation of "Lochiel." His father was the "Lochiel" who, restored to his estates under the amnesty of 1784, married a daughter of Sir Ralph Abercromby. The late Chief was their eldest son. He was born in 1796, and, entering the Guards, fought with them at Waterloo. He retired from the service in 1832, and afterwards married Lady Vere, youngest daughter of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, with whom he inherited considerable estates in England. During the late years of famine he spent large sums in aid of his Highland crofters, remitted rents to a great amount, and reduced his rents generally. His noble treatment of his tenants and dependants made him beloved in the Highlands. His eldest son inherits the Scotch estates; the second son takes by will the Hampden estate in Bucks.

Sept. 21. Aged 69, John Camidge, esq., Mus. Doc., Cantab., late organist of York Minster. The deceased was a composer of some celebrity, his genius being displayed in sacred music, as exemplified in the numerous anthems, church services, and chants, which he composed, and many of which are frequently sung.

March 31. At Duntroon, near Queanbeyan, New South Wales, aged 54, the Hon. Robert Campbell, esq., Colonial Treasurer.

Dec. 8. In Jermyn-st. St. James's, aged 42, Lieut.-Col. D. Campbell, C.B., of the 71st Highlanders. He served at the siege and fall of Sebastopol, and was made a C.B. for his services in the Crimea.

June 25. At Tours, France, aged 79, Lieut.-Col. Patrick Campbell, formerly of St. Catherine's, Argyleshire, and of H.M.'s Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Ninety-fifth Regts. He was with the army in Holland, under the command of the late Duke of York; was present, under Lord Nelson, at the battle of Copenhagen in 1801, for which he had the medal; and served in the Peninsula from 1808 to

1811, for which he received the medal and three clasps for Talavera, Busaco, and Albuera.

Feb. 10. At his residence, Barnes-pl., Mile-end-road, aged 72, Lieut. Archibald Campbell, R.N. He enjoyed a pension for wounds received in a cutting-out expedition against the Russians, where he had his arm shot off, a bayonet thrust through his breast, a bayonet wound in his groin, and a pistol bullet in his head.

Dec. 22. Aged 74, the Right Hon. Robert Dundas Duncan-Haldane, Earl of Camperdown, of Lundie, co. Forfar, and Glenagles, co. Perth, Viscount Duncan, of Camperdown, and Baron Duncan, of Lundie, all in the peerage of Great Britain. His Lordship was the eldest surviving son of the celebrated Admiral Lord Viscount Duncan, by Henrietta, daughter of the Right Hon. Robert Dundas, of Arniston, Lord President of the Court of Session in Scotland, and eldest brother of the famous Henry Dundas, first Viscount Melville. The Admiral was raised to the dignity of a Viscount for the great victory obtained by the fleet under his command off Camperdown, on the 11th of October, 1797, when the scheme of an invasion of Ireland by 40,000 troops, under General Hoche, perished with the Dutch fleet, which, as the fruits of "that great day's renown," was either destroyed or captured. The late peer chose his place from the first with the Whig Opposition, but seldom spoke in Parliament till 1820, when he took some active part in the trial of Queen Caroline. In 1830-31 his Lordship was prominent in the discussions in the House of Peers on the Scotch Reform Bill, and on the coronation of William IV. was elevated to the rank of an earl, the King being pleased, as his own special act, and as a tribute to the memory of the first peer, to adopt the unusual step in the case of a new creation of giving Lord Camperdown's brothers and sisters the rank of earl's children. His Lordship married in 1805 Janet, daughter of Sir Hew Dalrymple, of North Berwick and Tantallon Castle, in East Lothian, and leaves issue.

May 9. At Southsea, aged 76, Lieut.-Gen. Geo. Cardew, Col. Commandant, Royal Engineers.

Jan. 2. At Devonshire-pl., Portland-pl., aged 69, Anna Maria, widow of Sir James Rivett Carnac, bart.

April 24. At Newbold-terr., Leaming-

DEATHS.

ton, aged 73, Miss Jane Carnegie, third daughter of the late Sir David Carnegie, bart., of Kinnaird Castle.

Sept. 5. At Bath, aged 71, the Right Rev. Thomas Carr, D.D. (B.A. 1813), St. John's College, Cambridge, Bishop of Bombay 1836 to 1851, Rector of Bath (1854). The deceased prelate was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where, in 1813, he distinguished himself as senior optime. In 1836 he was appointed Bishop of Bombay, but resigned in 1851, in consequence of ill health. He was appointed rector of Bath in 1854, in which city he was universally esteemed, and his loss deeply regretted.

Dec. 21. At Cheltenham, Harriet Jane, wife of Rear-Adm. T. W. Carter, C.B., and eldest daughter of the late Adm. Sir Archibald Dickson, bart.

May 4. At Killiney, Dublin, aged 73, the Dowager Countess of Castlestuart.

July 16. At St. Leonards-on-the-Sea, aged 75, the Right Hon. Charles Murray Cathcart, Earl Cathcart, Viscount Cathcart, and Baron Greenock in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, and Baron Cathcart in Scotland, G.C.B., K.S.W., a general in the army, and colonel of the First Dragoon Guards.

The deceased was second son of the first Earl, who was raised to that dignity for his distinguished military service; and elder brother of General Cathcart, who was killed at Inkermann. He entered the army in 1799, and saw much active service, having served in the Helder expedition in 1799; in Naples and Sicily on the staff of General Sir James Craig during the campaigns of 1805-6; at the Walcheren expedition in 1809, taking part in the siege of Flushing; and subsequently, in 1812, having joined the army in the Peninsula, and taken part in the battles of Barossa, Salamanca, and Vittoria, during which he served as assistant-quartermaster-general; and during the campaigns of 1815 in the Netherlands and France. He was present at Waterloo as one of the Royal Staff Corps, acting as one of the assistant-quartermaster-generals attached to the British forces. He was appointed, in 1837, Commander of the Forces in Scotland, and Governor of Edinburgh Castle; and in 1846 was appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, &c. On his return from North America, he was appointed to the command of the Northern and Midland

District. For his services in the Peninsula he received the gold medal and two clasps, and in recognition of his services at Waterloo was made a Knight of the Order of St. Wilhelm of Holland, and of St. Wladimir of Russia. In 1838, he was nominated a K.C.B., and was made a Grand Cross only a few weeks since. The late Earl married in France in September, 1818, and in Portsea in February, 1819, Henrietta, second daughter of Mr. Thomas Mather, and has left issue.

Feb. 23. At Haine, from the effects of severe wounds received at the battle of Inkermann and at the siege of Lucknow, aged 24, John, eldest son of Albemarle Cator, esq., of Woodbastwick-hall, Norfolk, and Beckenham-pl., Kent.

March 26. At Doveridge, Derbyshire, the Hon. and Rev. Thomas Union Cavenish, M.A., Vicar of Doveridge (1839), Derbyshire; sixth and youngest surviving son of the first Lord Waterpark. He married, in 1845, Sophia, daughter of Sir John Robinson.

April 24. At Westburn, near Aberdeen, aged 80, David Chalmers, printer, the third in succession, from father to son, of the proprietors of the *Aberdeen Journal*.

Feb. 25. At Dresden, aged 59, the Rev. William Chamier, late Minister of the Episcopal Church, Rue d'Aguesseau, Paris.

April 24. Aged 71, William James Chaplin, esq., of Hyde-park-gardens, and Ewhurst-park, Hants, for many years head of the great carrying firm of Chaplin and Horne, M.P. for Salisbury, and chairman of the London and South-Western Railway. He was a son of the late Mr. William Chaplin, of Rochester, where he was born in 1787, and was educated at Bromley, Kent. He was for some years chairman of the South-Western Railway, and a director of the Paris and Rouen, the Rouen and Havre, and the Rhenish Railways. He also served the office of Sheriff of London and Middlesex in 1845-6. Mr. Chaplin, who was a magistrate and deputy-lieut. for Hants, was returned to Parliament in January, 1847, as M.P. for Salisbury, and again in July, 1852, being on both occasions at the head of the poll; but was not a candidate in 1857. Mr. Chaplin possessed great sagacity in matters of business, and by his clearness of head, cool judgment, and great energy of character, he succeeded in becoming one of the railway magnates of the age.

DEATHS.

Jan. 19. At Charleville Forest, Tullamore, aged 37, the Right Hon. Charles William George Bury, Earl of Charleville, Viscount Charleville, and Baron Tullamore, in the peerage of Ireland. His Lordship, who succeeded his father in the titles in July, 1851, married in 1850 Arabella Louisa, daughter of H. Case, esq., of Shenstone Moss, Staffordshire; and leaves issue.

Feb. 1. At Canterbury, aged 53, the Rev. William John Chesshyre, M.A., one of the Canons of Canterbury.

Mr. Chesshyre was the son of Rear-Adm. Chesshyre, and was educated at Rugby and Balliol College, Oxford. In 1841 he was presented by Archbishop Howley to the united parishes of St. Martin and St. Paul, Canterbury, in which city his influence, derived from his earnest character and a considerable private estate, was most beneficially exerted. To him is in a great degree due the restoration of the interesting churches of his parishes, and the foundation of parochial and general schools in the archiepiscopal city. He afterwards became tutor to the sons of the Earl of Egremont, was sent to Oxford by that nobleman in charge of his youngest son, and was rewarded for his care by presentation to two family benefices. In 1846 Mr. Chesshyre was appointed Rural Dean of Canterbury, and one of the six preachers of the Cathedral. Twice—in 1852, and again in 1857—the clergy of the diocese elected him as one of their proctors in Convocation; and, finally, in March, 1858, he was presented by the Crown, on the recommendation of Lord Derby, to the stall in Canterbury Cathedral, which had been vacated by the removal of Professor Stanley to Oxford—an appointment which was hailed with lively satisfaction by all to whom his character and merits were known. Unhappily Mr. Chesshyre's career of usefulness was drawing to its close. His health had given way; and after a vain resort to the foreign baths, he returned home to die.

June 17. At Ansley-hall, aged 80, Elizabeth Juliana, wife of Sir John Newdigate Ludford Chetwode, bart., of Ansley-hall, Warwickshire, and Oakley, Staffordshire; eldest daughter of the late John Newdigate Ludford, esq., of Ansley-hall.

Feb. 3. At Chichester, aged 80, the Very Rev. George Chandler, B.C.L. 1804, D.C.L. 1824, New College, Oxford, Dean of Chichester.

⌞ VOL. CI.

Dr. Chandler, who was for many years Rector of All Souls' Church, Marylebone, was educated at Winchester and Oxford; was Bampton Lecturer in 1825, and in 1830 was appointed Dean of Chichester. The period of his deanery will be ever remarkable in the annals of his cathedral city for the remarkable improvements effected by his energy, and to no small extent by his fortune. The venerable cathedral was renovated and beautified; stained glass windows—of which a memorial window erected by the Dean to his sister is very beautiful—inserted; new churches and schools erected in the city, and the social well-being of the inhabitants promoted in many ways. The venerable and venerated ecclesiastic has, moreover, bequeathed £2000 to be applied to building a new church, to endowing the Diocesan College, or improving the Cathedral church, at the judgment of the new Dean and the Archdeacons.

May 24. At Stackhouse, Settle, aged 73, T. Clapham, esq., Magistrate and Deputy-Lieut. for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

June 30. Aged 83, William Clark, esq., M.D., of Wester Moffat. Dr. Clark contributed nearly £30,000 to the establishment of the Free Church College in Glasgow.

Jan. 27. At Bethlem Hospital, Thos. Clark, a Chancery prisoner of 35 years' incarceration. This person, like Dickens's cobbler, was ruined by having a legacy left to him. Proceedings in Chancery were taken, and Clark refusing to plead was committed for contempt. Since, however, he held the property, though he could not touch it, and preferred remaining in prison to bringing it into court, his long detention was his own fault. He had several times been removed to Bethlem for insanity.

March 21. At Windsor, aged 67, Lieut.-Col. John Clarke, late of H.M.'s Sixty-sixth Regt.

July 31. At Wolverhampton, aged 74, N. R. Clarke, esq., Serjeant-at-Law, Judge of the County Courts of Wolverhampton, Oldbury, and Walsall, and Recorder of Lincoln, Newark, Northampton, and Walsall.

March 31. Miss Jane Clarke, the celebrated Court Milliner. Her property is estimated at £80,000, the principal portion of which is said to be left to the various charities of the metropolis. She has left several fine pictures to the National Gallery.

E E

DEATHS.

Jan. 9. At Raby Castle, aged 73, Sophia, Duchess of Cleveland, eldest dau. of John, fourth Earl Powlett, by his first marriage with Sophia, only daughter and heir of Admiral Sir George Pocock, K.H.; married on the 16th of November, 1809, the present Duke of Cleveland.

Aug. 4. In John-st., Berkeley-sq., aged 34, the Hon. Robert Windsor Clive, M.P. for South Shropshire, Deputy-Lieut. of Shropshire, and Captain in the Worcester Yeomanry Cavalry. The deceased was the eldest son of the late Hon. Robert Clive and the Baroness Windsor. and was born 25th of May, 1824. He married in October, 1852, Lady Mary, youngest daughter of the Earl of Bradford, by whom he leaves a youthful family. On the sudden death of his venerated father in January, 1854, he was returned as member for South Shropshire, having previously represented Ludlow.

Sept. 4. At the Deanery, aged 67, the very Rev. Charles Butler Clough, A.M., Dean of St. Asaph.

June 25. Killed in the disastrous action of the Peiho, Lieut. Charles Clutterbuck, R.N., of the *Coromandel*, youngest son of the late Major Clutterbuck, of Warkworth.

Jan. 20. At Highbeech, Essex, Mary Dowager Lady Cockburn, widow of the late Admiral of the Fleet, the Right Hon. Sir George Cockburn, bart., G.C.B., of Langton.

Feb. 23. At Cheltenham, aged 66, William Collins, esq., formerly M.P. for Warwick.

Sept. 12. At his seat, aged 74, John Stratford Collins, esq., of Wythall Walford, near Ross, Herefordshire, a magistrate of that county. He married, in 1855, Edith, daughter of Philip Jones, esq., of the Cleeve, and granddaughter of Sarah Kyrle, heiress of "The Man of Ross."

May 9. Drowned, on the West Coast of Africa, aged 28, Lieut. Thomas Haggerston Collingwood, fourth son of the late H. J. W. Collingwood, esq., of Lilburn Tower and Cornhill House, Northumberland.

Jan. 27. In Montagu-sq., aged 78, Frances, dau. of the late Sir Nathaniel Conant, of Portland-place.

Oct. 3. At Waldron House, near Tavistock, aged 74, William Courtenay, esq., a deputy-lieut. and magistrate for the county of Devon.

Dec. 10. At Edinburgh, aged 34, the Countess Dowager of Courtown, youngest daughter of the late Right Hon. Edward Pennefather, Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in Ireland.

June 7. At Harborne-heath, near Birmingham, aged 76, "Old" David Cox, one of the greatest—perhaps, if Turner be excepted, the greatest—of the great English school of water-colour painters.

He was a native of Birmingham. His first essays in painting were made as an assistant scene-painter at the theatre of that place. His early practice in this derided branch of the fine arts was probably of great service to him in after life when careful study had made him a perfect master of every minute detail of observation and practice; for to it he probably owed that dashing style in which by a few bold and masterly strokes he produced mighty effects. Leaving the rough and probably ill-remunerated trade of painting for the stage, he practised in London and in Leicestershire as a teacher of drawing—higher as an art, but probably scarcely more remunerative; for he is said to have owed his chief subsistence at this period to the sale of his vigorous drawings, works which were then well sold at a very low price, and now, could they be recovered, worth their weight in gold. He has been described as the high-priest of rustic nature. "Stony Wales and castled Yorkshire afforded the chief scenes of his studies and his triumphs. The wet moorland, the hanging wood, the dark quarry, the rattling rivulet, the stormy sky, the rain-laden and wind-blown cloud, were the aspects of nature on which his eye dwelt with peculiar love. His brush was easy, and his power of hinting detail marvellous. No man who ever lived could say so much with means so slight. Nothing in nature seemed to escape his eye, and what he saw perfectly he could depict perfectly. He has left behind him proofs innumerable of this art of seeing well; of that patience of observation that grows at last into genius. His wonderful eye for the intricacies and tones of shrubs, cloud and rain, gives to his drawings the deceptive touch of life."

March 19. At Highfield, Southampton, aged 68, Col. Eyre John Crabbe, K.H., lately commanding the Seventy-fourth Highlanders, and J.P. for the Southern Division of the county of Hampshire, and for the borough of Southampton.

DEATHS.

The gallant Colonel had received the silver war-medal and eight clasps for his early career in the Peninsula, and was made a knight of the Royal Hanoverian Order for his military services. The deceased served in the Peninsula from January, 1810, to the 31st December, 1812; and again from June, 1813, to the end of the war, including the whole of the retreat to the lines of Torres Vedras; battle of Busaco; the advance from the lines to Guarda; first siege of Badajoz; siege and storm of Ciudad Rodrigo; siege and storm of Badajoz; battle of Salamanca; capture of Madrid, and subsequent retreat through Spain; battles of Nivelle, Nive, Vie, Tarbes, Orthes, and Toulouse, and the whole of the various minor affairs during that period. Colonel Crabbe was wounded in March, 1811, at Foz d'Aronce, when commanding a party which drove a French picket from that village; and again at Toulouse, when attacking the *tête de pont*.

May 22. At Ottershaw Park, Surrey, very suddenly, in his 73rd year, Richard Crawshay, esq., the eldest son of the late William Crawshay, the well-known ironmaster. Mr. Crawshay derived from his father a large share in the great iron-works at Cyfarthfa, Merthyr Tydvil, but had retired on a very ample fortune.

March 28. At Allington-castle, Kent, aged 84, Miss Ann Crispe.

April 17. At Cheltenham, aged 74, Mary Anne, second and last surviving dau. of the late Rev. Sir Herbert Croft, bart.

December 5. At his residence, very suddenly, in his 64th year, Sir Richard Budden Crowder, one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas. The deceased Judge was the eldest son of the late Mr. William Henry Crowder, of Montague-place. He was educated first at Eton, and then at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in 1821, and subsequently went the Western Circuit. In 1837 he became a Queen's Counsel, and in August, 1846, Recorder of Bristol. For some time he held the appointment of Counsel to the Admiralty, and Judge-Advocate of the Fleet. He represented the borough of Liskeard in Parliament, in the Liberal interest, from January, 1849, to the time of his elevation to the bench. On this occasion he received the customary order of knighthood.

March 24. At Gravesend, after landing from the ship *Coldstream*, on the

1st, aged 43, R. Y. Cummins, esq., late Assistant Colonial Secretary and Acting Secretary to the Council of Government; from excessive tropical debility and unremitting attention to his responsible duties during twenty-five years' residence in the colony of Mauritius.

Sept. 10. At his seat near Wrexham, aged 74, General Sir Robert Henry Cunliffe, bart. The deceased General entered the East India Company's service in the Bengal army in 1798. He gained the rank of General in October, 1857, and for his military services in India was nominated a C.B.

May 9. At Rome, Marjory, relict of Major-Gen. Cunningham, H.E.I.C.S., of Newton, Perthshire.

Sept. 23. At the Island of Trinidad, West Indies, Roger William Curtis, esq., third son of Admiral Sir Lucius Curtis, bart., C.B., of East Cosham, Hants.

Jan. 29. In the burning of the steam-boat *North Carolina*, in Chesapeake Bay, U.S., aged 71, Dr. Thomas Curtis, of Limestone Springs, South Carolina, the original editor of the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana," and of Tegg's "London Cyclopædia."

April 14. In Berkeley-sq., aged 90, the Hon. Elizabeth Curzon, dau. of the late Viscount Curzon.

Feb. 16. At Boulevard de Waterloo, Brussels, aged 65, the Hon. William Mackenzie Dawson Damer.

Nov. 6. At Breadsall Priory, Sir Francis Sacheverel Darwin, aged 74.

He was the last surviving son of the celebrated Dr. Darwin, the philosophic poet, whose "Loves of the Plants" is a singular example of science reduced to verse. Sir Francis Darwin was a physician, and ranked high in scientific attainments, inheriting his father's literary tastes and distinguished abilities. He resided for sometime at Lichfield, where he had extensive practice in his profession, and subsequently at Sydnope, near Matlock. The last twelve years of his life were spent at Breadsall Priory. He leaves issue ten children. The mantle of the scientific poet has fallen on one of his grandsons, Charles Darwin, who, besides his fame as the Naturalist of the Voyage of the *Beagle*, has recently published a work entitled "The Origin of Species," which opens a new field for philosophic inquiry.

March 19. At Rosiere, Lyndhurst, Louisa Henriette, wife of Vice-Admiral Dashwood.

E E 2

DEATHS.

Jan. 30. At Exmouth, aged 69, Charlotte Sophia, third and last surviving dau. of the late John Daubeney, esq., of Berkeley-sq., Bristol, and sister of the late Lt.-Gen. Henry Daubeney, K.H., Col. of the Eightieth Foot.

May 14. At Brecon, aged 82, the Ven. Richard Davies, B.A. 1798, M.A. 1800, Christ Church, Oxford, Canon of St. David's (1805), Archdeacon of Brecon (1804), and Vicar of Brecon.

April 12. At his seat, Hornby Castle, near Lancaster, aged 80, Pudsey Dawson, esq. The venerable gentleman was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant of the county, and, some years ago, served the office of high-sheriff. He was the eldest son of Mr. Pudsey Dawson, Mayor of Liverpool in 1779 and 1780, the founder of the School for the Indigent Blind in that town, the first of the kind established in England. On his father's death, in 1816, he succeeded to the estate of Langeliffe Hall, Yorkshire, where the family had long been settled; and in 1840 he became the successor of his relative, Admiral Tatham, in the estate of Hornby Castle, of which the Admiral became possessed as heir-at-law at the conclusion of the memorable will cause, "*Tatham v. Wright.*"

June 1. Edward Dawson, esq., of Whatton House, Leicestershire, aged 57, formerly M.P. for South Leicestershire.

Dec. 8. At his residence, Windsor-terr., Stoke, aged 86, Mr. Edward Deagon, R.N. The deceased served under Nelson at the victory of the Nile.

Feb. 17. At Portman-sq., aged 31, the Lady Delamere, second daughter of the Earl of Kinnoull.

Jan. 26. At Leamington, aged 82, Charlotte, widow of John Denison, esq., of Ossington, Notts, and mother of the Speaker, the late Bishop of Salisbury, the Governor-Gen. of Australia, &c.

March 19. At Shrivenham, in Berkshire (the residence of his brother-in-law, the Ven. Archdeacon Berens), aged 81, the Right Hon. William Courtenay, tenth Earl of Devon, a baronet, D.C.L., High Steward of the University of Oxford, and a Governor of the Charterhouse. The late Earl was eldest son of Henry Reginald, Lord Bishop of Exeter, by Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter of Thomas, second Earl of Effingham. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1812 he was elected to the House of Commons for Exeter, which city he con-

tinued to represent up to 1826. He had been called to the bar of Lincoln's-inn in 1799, and was for a short time a Master in Chancery. On his retirement from the House of Commons he was appointed Clerk-Assistant to the Parliaments, an office he held for nineteen years,—in fact, until his accession to the peerage in 1835; and on that occasion the House of Lords unanimously voted him their thanks. The Earldom of Devon had been dormant from the death, in 1556, of Edmund, son of Henry, the attainted Marquis of Exeter, in whose behalf the Earldom of Devon had been revived in 1553. In 1831, it was adjudged by the House of Lords to William, third Viscount Courtenay, cousin of the deceased Earl, who succeeded to the title on his demise in 1835. His lordship married, first, on the 29th of Nov., 1804, Lady Harriet Leslie, daughter of Sir Henry Pepps, bart., and Jane Elizabeth, Countess of Rothes, by whom, who died in 1839, he has left surviving issue; and, secondly, in 1849, Miss Scott, daughter of the late Rev. J. M. Scott. In 1837 he was created a D.C.L. of Oxford University; and in 1838 elected High Steward of that University.

Oct. 24. At Teignmouth, at a very advanced age, Maj.-Gen. Thomas Dickinson, Colonel of the Tenth Bengal N.I. The deceased general had seen much active service during our earliest campaigns in India, having been in the Indian army over half a century, and had received many decorations.

July 22. At Norfolk-crescent, aged 57, Ann Eliza, wife of the Rev. J. D. Wingfield Digby, Vicar of Coleshill, Warwickshire.

Dec. 19. At Gloucester-pl., Hyde Park, Sarah, only daughter of the late Isaac Disraeli, esq., of Bradenham, Bucks, author of "*Curiosities of Literature*," and only sister of the Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P.

March 9. At Newcastle, aged 83, Dixon Dixon, esq., Unthank Hall, near Haltwhistle, a magistrate and deputy-lieut. for the county of Northumberland.

Feb. 10. At Ashburton House, Putney Heath, Sarah Helena, widow of Sir Compton Domville, bart., of Santry House, co. Dublin.

Dec. 5. At Chesham-place, aged 76, the Right Hon. Lord Wm. Robert Keith Douglas, youngest brother of Charles, fifth

DEATHS.

Marquis of Queensberry, and of John, sixth Marquis. He represented the Dumfries District of Burghs in Parliament for twenty-two years, and was one of the Council of the Duke of Clarence when he held the office of Lord High Admiral.

July 15. At Durham, aged 66, the Rev. Henry Douglas, one of the Canons of the Cathedral.

Feb. 4. Of fever, *en route* up the Indus, in medical charge of troops, aged 42, Surgeon R. R. Dowse, Seventieth Regt., eldest son of R. Dowse, esq., Inspector-Gen. of Hospitals. The deceased served in the West Indies, South America, Brazil, China, St. Helena, Mediterranean, and through the Crimean campaign, for which he received the medal, with three clasps—Alma, Inkermann, and Sebastopol—and the Turkish Order of the Medjidie.

Dec. 24. At South Hiltan, near Sunderland, aged 107, James Doyle. Deceased was a native of Ireland, and was a papermaker by trade.

May 4. At Brighton, aged 64, Col. Edward Drummond.

Oct. 5. At Leamington, Lady Duberly, dau. of Chas. St. Barbe, esq., of Lynton, and relict of Sir Jas. Duberly, of Gaines Hall, Huntingdonshire.

Feb. 13. At Cadogan-place, the Hon. Lady Duff, widow of Gen. the Hon. Sir Alexander Duff, G.C.H., and mother of the Earl of Fife.

May 14. At Gattonside House, Melrose, Gen. Alexander Duncan, Bengal Army.

June 16. At Rocklands, Chudleigh, Devon, aged 73, Vice-Admiral Sir David Dunn, knt., K.C.H.

June 15. At Shrewsbury, aged 95, Lady Edwardes, widow of the Rev. Sir John Cholmondeley Edwardes, bart.

Nov. 20. At his residence, Hookward Park, near Limpsfield, Surrey, aged 81, the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone, formerly Governor of Bombay. This distinguished civil servant of the East India Company was the fourth son of the eleventh Lord Elphinstone. Probably his family influence obtained him an early presentation to a cadetship, for he joined the Bengal Civil Service at the age of 18, and was very early an *attaché* to the Political Resident at the Court of the Peshwah (Nana's adoptive father) when the Duke of Wellington visited it, at the beginning of this century. Mr. Elphinstone was attached in a political capacity to General Wellesley's mission to the Mahratta chiefs, Scindiah, Holkar,

and the Rajah of Berar. The mission failed, and in the great battle of Assaye Mr. Elphinstone rode constantly by the commander's side, acting virtually as an aide-de-camp. He is said to have shown during this campaign so remarkable an aptitude for military command, that the future Duke told him he had mistaken his profession. In 1808 he was intrusted with an important mission in Central Asia, being nominated our first Envoy to Kabul. At Peshawur he concluded the important alliance with Shah Shuja which has since led to many complications and disasters, but which was triumphant for its immediate purpose, as a treaty was signed by which the Shah engaged to join the Afghan arms to those of the English in the event of a French invasion of India. Of this mission Mr. Elphinstone published a most interesting account. In 1816, when the Marquis of Hastings took the command of the armies of the three Presidencies against the confederated Mahratta powers, of which the Peshwah was the chief, Mr. Elphinstone was the British representative at his court, and penetrated the inmost soul of that worthy sire of Nana Sahib, although he had succeeded in making Sir John Malcolm believe that he was a faithful ally of the English. In the course of a few weeks Elphinstone's opinion of our ally was painfully verified to him by being burnt out of his own ambassadorial dwelling by the emissaries of this friend, and he reached the British camp with nothing except the horse he rode and the clothes he wore. He forthwith ordered the British commander to march down and attack the Mahrattas, and the outrage was avenged by the victory of Kirkee. The British commander had risen from his couch, where he was stretched by a partial paralysis, to lead his troops; and, judging from the fact that when her Majesty bestowed a medal for this victory one was awarded to Mr. Elphinstone (the only decoration he ever had, because the only one he could not have refused with grace), we may believe those who told us that Mr. Elphinstone commanded on that day. The result of the war of which the battle of Kirkee was the commencement, consolidated that Indian British empire which has lately so nearly crumbled in our hands; and Mountstuart Elphinstone was nominated the sole British Commissioner for the settlement of the Peshwah's territories. By his judicious administra-

DEATHS.

tion, he won the love and respect of all the inhabitants of that conquered country, but he governed it for itself, and with due regard to the rights and privileges and with magnanimity for the feelings of the people at his feet.

Mr. Elphinstone in 1820 became Governor of Bombay, to which Presidency the Peshwah's country was attached; and during the seven years he ruled Western India the Elphinstone code became law, which, for its brevity, its completeness, its clearness, its enlightened provisions, might be compared to the Code Napoleon.

Of the extraordinary capacity of Mr. Elphinstone for the highest duties of administration, of his industry, his high-minded independence, his learning, and his exemplary conduct in private life, the apostolic Bishop Heber has given a touching account. No governor in India had then paid so much attention to schools and public institutions, under none were the taxes lighter; and in the administration of justice to the natives in their own languages, in the degree in which natives were employed in official situations, and in the countenance and familiarity extended to natives of all ranks, Mr. Elphinstone reduced to practice almost all the reforms required in the system of government of India.

When Mr. Elphinstone left India in 1827, in addition to the presentation of addresses from all classes, a college, called after him "The Elphinstone College," was established by the natives; his statue by Chantrey adorns the Town-hall; and other substantial tokens of respect and affection were offered. When Mr. Elphinstone returned home he wrote his well-known and greatest work, his "History of India," which has won for him the title of the Tacitus of Indian historians. Such was the distinction of his services, that twice attempts were made to draw him from his retirement by the most splendid rewards that can be offered to a British subject—the Governor-Generalship of India, and the Governor-Generalship of Canada, with a peerage; and on her Majesty's accession, he was selected, as the most distinguished of her Indian servants, for the Order of the Bath and a seat in the Privy Council. These great inducements failed to dazzle the retired statesman, and they were steadily refused; but his experienced wisdom was always at the service of the Queen's advisers, and his influence continued to be deeply felt in all matters

connected with the administration of our Indian Empire.

April 15. In Cadogan-place, Belgravia, aged 53, after a few days' illness, George Cary Elwes, esq.

Sept. 24. At Standon, Newport, Isle of Wight, in his 87th year, General Henry Eveleigh, R.A. The General, who bore the oldest commission in the Royal Artillery, served in the Corunna campaign, and received the war medal and one clasp for Sahagun and Benevente.

Sept. 8. At Bilton Hall, Warwickshire, aged 53, Major-Gen. Sir William Eyre, K.C.B., late in command of the forces in Canada. The deceased was the second son of the late Adm. Sir George Eyre, K.C.B., and entered the army in 1823. After serving as major of the Seventy-third Regiment in Canada, he proceeded with that gallant corps to the Cape of Good Hope, and while there greatly distinguished himself in both the Caffre wars as lieutenant-colonel. In acknowledgment of his eminent services in the last and previous war, he was made a C.B., promoted to be colonel in the army, and appointed an aide-de-camp to the Queen. His military reputation was now very high; and on the outbreak of the Russian war, the deceased was appointed to a brigade of the Third Division of the army in the East, which he ultimately commanded, with the local and temporary rank of lieutenant-general. He was present at the battle of the Alma, and commanded the troops in the trenches during the battle of Inkermann, and remained in the Crimea until after the fall of Sebastopol. For services in the war he received a medal and clasps. In 1855 he was made a K.C.B., a Commander of the Legion of Honour, a Knight of the Imperial Order of the Medjidie of the 2nd class, and was among the general officers of the army who received the Sardinian war medal. After his return home in June, 1856, he was selected by the Commander-in-Chief to command the troops in Canada. The gallant General had been in bad health for months past, and was in consequence of illness compelled to resign his command in North America, in which he was succeeded last June by Major-General Sir William Fenwick Williams, of Kars. The late General was one of the field officers in the receipt of rewards for distinguished or meritorious services.

July 27. At Ripon, aged 72, the Hon. and Very Rev. Henry David Erskine,

DEATHS.

Dean of Ripon. The Dean was the second son of the great Lord Erskine. Having taken holy orders, he was presented to the rectory of Swithland, co. Leicester, and in 1847 was appointed Dean of Ripon. He married in 1813 Lady Harriet Dawson, daughter of the Earl of Portarlington. The reverend gentleman was a most accomplished and amiable man, and, as became such a father, was one of the most earnest advocates of the instruction and well-being of the lower classes. Through his agency the blessings of popular education have been widely spread throughout Yorkshire, and the independent spirit of the working class fostered by the numerous Mechanics' and other educational institutes of which he was the ready supporter.

June 1. In Thurloe-sq., Brompton, aged 78, Sir Chas. Coningham Fairlie, bart., of Robertland and Fairlie, Ayrshire.

February. In Amptill-sq., aged upwards of 80, Mr. Charles Farley, once a favourite actor in melodramatic pieces. So many years have elapsed since Farley's retirement from the stage, that, although he was to the last an object of respect and even affection among the elder members of the theatrical profession, his name had become unknown to the present generation of play-goers. It is in the history of pantomime and melodrama, when in the good old days they regularly constituted the supplementary entertainment of an evening at the patent theatres, that he appeared as an important figure, and hence his fame was of a less durable character than that which is attained in the higher walks of the profession. For a long series of years the Christmas pantomime at Covent-garden was the result of his labour, and he assisted Mr. Thomas Dibdin in the composition of *Mother Goose*, a work to which veterans still point as having achieved the *ne plus ultra* of popularity, and raised to the pinnacle of celebrity the immortal Joseph Grimaldi. *Timour the Tartar*, the great equestrian drama, which delighted the public and scandalized the refined few who took offence at the introduction of horses on the sacred boards of Covent-garden, and the *Miller and his Men*, that most famous work of the old robber class, which, though now seldom acted, is still familiar to every juvenile owner of a toy-theatre, and is moreover associated with the charming music of the late Sir H. R. Bishop, were both produced under

the superintendence of Mr. Farley, and stand prominent among innumerable pieces of a similar kind.

Aug. 29. At his residence, Wickham-court, Kent, aged 71, the Rev. Sir Charles Francis Farnaby, bart. The baronetcy is now extinct.

Oct. 10. At Hastings, aged 73, Col. William Fawcett, son of the late Maj.-Gen. William Fawcett, and grandson of the late Gen. Sir William Fawcett, K. C. B., Gov. of Chelsea Hospital, &c.

March 13. Aged 89, John Feilden, esq., of Mollington-hall, Chester.

Nov. 3. At Beechworth, Australia, after a short illness (eight days after the wreck of the *Royal Charter*, in which his wife and children perished), Robert Wyndham Fenwick, esq., third surviving son of the late Rev. Collingwood Fenwick, Rector of Brooke, Isle of Wight.

Oct. 6. At the Windsor Hotel, Edinburgh, aged 24, Robert Cutlar Fergusson, esq., of Craigdarroch and Orroland, only son of the late Right Hon. Robert Cutlar Fergusson, of Craigdarroch, Judge Advocate-General, and many years M.P. for the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. The deceased was the head of an ancient and wealthy family, the representation of which has descended in a direct and unbroken line from father to son since about the year 1252 A.D., and which now devolves on his son, Robert Cutlar, who was born in 1855.

March 13. At his residence, Staunton Harold, Leicestershire, of congestion of the lungs, aged 37, the Right Hon. Washington Sewallis Shirley, ninth Earl Ferrers, Viscount Tamworth, and a baronet. His lordship succeeded to the title on the death of his grandfather, in 1842, and married, in 1844, Augusta Annabella, daughter of Lord Edward Chichester, second son of the second Marquis of Donegal, by whom he leaves issue.

Aug. 15. At his residence, Wellingtonter., Radipole, near Weymouth, aged 82, Vice-Adm. Abel Ferris.

Jan. 28. At Woodbury, Exeter, aged 86, the Rev. Francis Filmer, B.C.L., Alban Hall, Oxford, youngest son of the late Rev. Sir Edmund Filmer, of East Sutton, Kent.

Nov. 19. At Little Packington Rectory, aged 60, the Hon. and Rev. Charles Finch, M.A., Rector of Packington and of Meriden, youngest brother of the late Earl of Aylesford.

Dec. 7. At his residence, Highland Lodge, near Portsmouth, in his 75th year,

John Fincham, esq., for many years Master Shipwright of Portsmouth Dockyard, and formerly Superintendent of the School of Naval Architecture at Portsmouth. The deceased was an officer of the greatest ability, and had built many of the noblest ships in the British navy. His "History of Naval Architecture," "Outlines of Shipbuilding," a "Treatise on Laying-off Ships," and on "Masting Ships," are invaluable for the amount of research and professional knowledge they contain.

July 17. At Ipswich, aged 67, Mr. William Stephenson Fitch, a local antiquarian of great diligence. His collections towards the topographical and antiquarian history of Suffolk are extremely interesting. They filled no less than thirty volumes, and are deposited in the Museum of the West Suffolk Archaeological Society, at Bury St. Edmund's. Mr. Fitch edited several ancient Tracts, which he illustrated from rich stores of half-forgotten learning. Among them is "Maitland's Narrative of the Principal Acts of the Regency during the Minority; and other Papers relating to the History of Mary Queen of Scotland." This is a very singular document, by the son of that Maitland who was Mary's Secretary. The Narrative was written to justify his father. In a letter written by Randolph, also included in the volume, the fate of Rizzio is mentioned ten days before it took place. It also insinuates that Henry Darnley imputed guilt to Mary at the time. Mr. Fitch also possessed a large collection of autograph papers and letters relating to Mary and Scottish affairs, illustrating the eventful period of her life and rule.

April 17. At Club-chambers, Regent-st., aged 74, Col. Chas. FitzGerald, C.B., formerly of the Sixth Bengal Cavalry.

Oct. 15. Cecilia Maria, widow of the Right Hon. Maurice FitzGerald, Knight of Kerry.

May 30. Aged 56, Capt. John Coghan Fitz-Gerald, R.N., Superintendent of H.M.'s Naval Dockyard, Sheerness.

Dec. 22. In Sussex-sq., Kemp Town, Brighton, in his 53rd year, the Right Hon. Henry Fitzroy, M.P. for Lewes, and Chief Commissioner of Works.

The right hon. gentleman was a son of the second Lord Southampton, and only brother and heir presumptive of the present Lord. Mr. Fitzroy was first returned to Parliament for the borough of Great Grimsby; and after several times

unsuccessfully contesting Lewes, he was returned in 1837, since which time he has sat for that borough. In 1846 he was a Lord of the Admiralty in Sir Robert Peel's Ministry, and in December, 1852, he became Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, and remained in that office till February, 1855. In March of the same year he was appointed Chairman of Committees of the House of Commons. Under the Government of Lord Palmerston he became President of the Board of Works, which office he held at his decease.

Feb. 12. At Brighton, the Lady Georgina Forbes. Her ladyship was the youngest dau. of William sixth Marquis of Lothian, K.T., by Harriet, dau. of Henry third Duke of Buccleuch, and married, in July, 1849, the Rev. Granville Hamilton Forbes, rector of Broughton, Northamptonshire.

Nov. 5. At Canaan-park, Charles Hay Forbes, esq., second surviving son of the late Sir Wm. Forbes, bart., of Pitsligo.

Sept. 25. At Madeira, the Hon. John Wm. Fortescue, second son of the Earl Fortescue by his first marriage with Lady Susan Ryder, eldest dau. of the late Earl of Harrowby.

April 16. At the Norfolk Hotel, Bognor, aged 31, Hugh Ebrington Fortescue, esq.

April 2. At Brooklands-pl., Cambridge, aged 77, Richard Foster, esq., an eminent inhabitant of that town.

Dec. 25. At Holford, near Sunbury, aged 75, Col. Thos. Fraser, of Balhain and Farradine, formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Assistant Quartermaster-General to the Forces serving on the eastern coast of Spain.

May 23. At the British Consulate, Rome, Mr. Freeborn, many years British Consul in Rome.

July 7. At the Rectory of Roydon, Diss, aged 80, the Rev. Temple Frere, M.A., Canon of Westminster. Mr. Temple Frere was of an old Norfolk family, being the son of John Frere, esq., of Roydon Hall, Norfolk, and Farningham, Suffolk, M.P. for Norwich; and was also nearly related to the late Right Hon. John Hookham Frere, the colleague of Canning in the *Anti-Jacobin*; Mr. Sergeant Frere, Master of Downing College, Cambridge; Mr. B. Frere, H.E.I.C.S.; and Mr. Henry Bartle Frere, C.B., our able Commissioner in Seinde. Having served for some time as Chaplain to the House of Commons, he was gazetted to a

DEATHS.

canonry in Westminster in November, 1838.

Oct. 21. In Queen-st., Mayfair, Jane, widow of the Rev. Temple Frere, Canon of Westminster and Rector of Roydon, Norfolk.

Feb. 23. At Dartington, Devon, aged 90, the Ven. Robert Hurrell Froude, B.A. 1792, M.A. 1795, Oriel College, Oxford, Archdeacon of Totnes (1820), R. of Dartington (1799), and of Denbury (1798), Devon.

Sept. 10. At Yarmouth, aged 73, John Fryer, esq., of Chatteris, formerly Sheriff of Cambs. and Hunts.

Nov. 1. At the Paddock, Canterbury, aged 57, William Henry Furley, esq., banker, of that city.

Lately. At Sunderland, Mrs. Garrick, widow of the nephew of the great David Garrick. She followed her profession of an actress for sixty-five years.

Sept. 22. Aged 72, E. George, esq., of Plascon, near Narberth, J.P. for the counties of Carmarthen and Pembroke.

Aug. 31. In St. Peter's-sq., Hammer-smith, in his 79th year, Lieut.-Gen. Charles Gilmour, R.A. The gallant officer had been above sixty years in the army, and during his early career had seen much active service, having served at the capture of Ischia, Zante, and Cephalonia in 1809, and at Santa Maura in the following year. He served also on the east coast of Spain, was present at the battle of Castalla, and in the batteries against Tarragona, and under Lord William Bentinck at Genoa.

April 27. At St. John's-lodge, Regent's Park, aged 81, Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, bart., F.R.S., Baron de Goldsmid of the kingdom of Portugal, one of our most noted financiers, leaving a fortune estimated by rumour at three millions sterling. He was created a baronet in 1841 by the Government of Lord Melbourne, and received the title of "Baron" from the Queen of Portugal for success in negotiating the settlement of the claims of Portugal upon Brazil.

Oct. 13. At his seat, Roundhay, near Leeds, Sir George Goodman, knight.

Sir George was a magistrate for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and for the borough of Leeds, and was the first mayor for that borough under the Municipal Corporations Act of 1836. To the same office he was also elected in 1846, 1850, and 1851, in the last of which years he received the honour of knighthood. In 1852 he was elected for the borough, with

the Right Hon. E. Baines; but his unremitting attention to his parliamentary duties brought on paralysis, and he did not offer himself at the general election in 1857.

April 23. At Ebury-st., aged 54, the Hon. William Gore.

April 19. At the Hotel Windsor, Rue Rivoli, Paris, aged 56, Sir Harry Dent Goring, bart., of Highden, Sussex. He was twice married; in 1827 to Augusta, dau. of Colonel J. Harvey, and in 1842 to Mary Elizabeth, dau. of J. G. Lewis, esq., and widow of J. Panton, esq. He was educated at Westminster. In 1832 he was elected member for the Rape of Bramber, which he held till 1841. He was High Sheriff of Anglessea in 1848, and a Deputy-Lieut. for the county, and also for Sussex.

June 11. At Mount Ospringe, Faversham, aged 90, General Gerard Gosselin. The deceased entered the army so far back as 1780, and was nearly the senior of the generals. He served under Lord William Bentinck at Genoa, and commanded a brigade in the American war, where he was present at the operations on the Penobscot.

May 11. In Green-st., Grosvenor-sq., aged 70, Vice-Admiral Percy Grace. This gallant officer was midshipman of the *Ganges*, and served in the fleet under Lord Nelson at the battle of Copenhagen, in 1801, and of the *Greyhound* at the capture of the *Pallas* frigate, near Java, in 1806. He was acting lieutenant of the *Piedmontaise*, and was severely wounded while in action with the Malays in 1809; and assisted at the destruction of a brig of 16 guns and 136 men, under the batteries of Royan, in the boats of the *Semiramis*, of which ship he was lieutenant. Admiral Grace was named in the *Gazette* in 1806, and twice in 1811, for his valuable services.

Dec. 16. At Bayswater, aged 70, the Dowager Lady Graham, widow of the late Sir R. Graham, bart., of Esk, Cumberland.

Oct. 24. At Cleatham, near Staindrop, aged 48, Henry George Granger, esq., youngest brother of the late Thomas Colpitts Granger, esq., barrister and M.P. for Durham.

March 3. At Shawefield, Havant, Hants, aged 75, Rear-Adm. Sir Richard Grant.

Oct. 15. At his residence, Chester-terr., Regent's Park, aged 64, Sir Thomas Tassell Grant, K.C.B., F.R.S., late Comp-

DEATHS.

troller of the Victualling and Transport Office of the Admiralty. The capacity of this valuable civil servant had been severely tested upon several occasions, and on each he had been found competent. He was, indeed, one of the few who had efficiently met the vast requirements of the Crimean war. Besides the arduous duties of his office he was the inventor of several mechanical improvements in connection with the naval service. In 1829 he devised the well-known steam machinery for the manufacture of biscuit, which has conferred so great a benefit on the navy, while it effects a saving to the country amounting annually to £30,000. In recognition of the value of this invention, the sum of £2000 was conferred by Parliament, and medals presented to him by the King of the French and the Society of Arts. Afterwards he constructed a new life-buoy, a feathering paddle-wheel, and about the year 1839 the patent fuel which bore his name, and which is largely used in the steam marine. Lastly, he applied his mind to achieving the long-desired object of distilling fresh water from the sea. This valuable invention cost him 15 or 20 years' study and experiment. The apparatus is either connected with the ordinary ship's galley, or (in the case of a steam-vessel) with the boilers of the ship. By this invention the sanitary and moral condition of the navy has been greatly advanced, and it has been truly described as the greatest benefit that has ever been conferred on the sailor. Among the "blue-books" is a report from the Commander-in-Chief of the Baltic Fleet, stating that "in three months eleven ships distilled upwards of 4700 tons of water, and that it was impossible to speak too highly of so useful an invention." The *Wye* was expressly fitted up with the distilling apparatus, and sent to the Crimea to assist in supplying fresh water to our transports and troops. This vessel alone was capable of producing upwards of 10,000 gallons of fresh water daily. The unexampled labour thrown upon his department during the war had so overtaxed his strength that he resigned his office some time last year, when Her Majesty was pleased to recognize the value of his services by conferring upon him the distinction of a K.C.B.

Aug. 30. At Woodhill, near Aberdeen, Sir James Grant, bart., of Monymusk.

July 16. Henry Grattan, esq., late M.P. for the county of Meath, and only surviving son of the great Henry Grattan. Mr. Grattan was a devoted friend of liberalism in the widest acceptation of the term, and was among the faithful few who adhered to Mr. O'Connell throughout his stormy career of Irish agitation. Mr. Grattan leaves no male issue, his children consisting of two daughters, both married.

June 25. Killed before the Peiho forts, Lieutenant Alfred Graves (1850).

March 10. At Banner-cross, near Sheffield, aged 66, Henry Marwood Greaves, esq., of Ford Hall, and of Banner-cross; a magistrate for the counties of Derby, Nottingham, and York, and a Deputy-Lieut. of Derbyshire.

Nov. 14. At his house in St. James's-sq., aged 78, the Right Hon. Thomas Philip Earl de Grey, of Wrest, Bedfordshire, Baron Lucas, of Crudwell, Wilts, and Baron Grantham, of Grantham, Lincolnshire, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, and a baronet.

Earl de Grey was the eldest of the two sons of Thomas Robinson, second Lord Grantham, and Lady Mary Jemima Yorke, second daughter of Philip, second Earl of Hardwicke, and Jemima Marchioness Grey, sister and heiress of Amabel, late Countess De Grey, and granddaughter of last Duke of Kent of the de Grey family. He was born at Whitehall, Dec. 8, 1781. He succeeded his father in the barony of Grantham in July, 1786, being at the time not five years of age; and on the death of his maternal aunt, Countess De Grey, in May, 1833, succeeded to the earldom. His Lordship married, on the 20th of July, 1805, Lady Henrietta Frances Cole, fifth daughter of William Willoughby, first Earl of Ebnishkillen, by whom, who died in 1848, he leaves surviving issue. The deceased Earl was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. His Lordship, during Sir Robt. Peel's short administration in 1834-35, held the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, and was made a Privy Counsellor. On Sir Robert Peel again coming into power in 1841, the Earl De Grey was selected for the high appointment of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. He discharged the functions of his viceregal position with much credit up to June, 1844, when he retired, to the great regret of the people of Dublin; for, while the representative of his Sovereign, the hospitalities of the Viceregal Court were

DEATHS.

sustained most liberally, not alone by the noble Earl, but by his estimable Countess, who gave great encouragement to the manufactures of her native country. On his retirement from Ireland the noble Earl may be said to have relinquished political life, for beyond an occasional vote in support of the Liberal-Conservative party he has not interfered in political matters. The late Earl was Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of Bedfordshire, an Aide-de-Camp to Her Majesty, and in 1844 was nominated a Knight of the Garter. His Lordship was also Lieut.-Colonel Commandant of the Yorkshire Hussar Regt. of Yeomanry Cavalry, President of the Institute of British Architects, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and of the Society of Antiquaries, and other learned institutions. The earldoms of De Grey and the barony of Grantham devolve upon his nephew, the Earl of Ripon, son of his half-brother. The ancient barony of Lucas of Crudwell, Wilts, passes to his Lordship's eldest daughter, the Countess (Dowager) Cowper. His Lordship changed his family name of Robinson first for that of Weddell, and on his accession to the earldom assumed that of De Grey only.

Jan. 13. At Edinburgh, aged 81, the Rev. Henry Grey, D.D. This venerable and amiable man was the oldest ordained minister of the Free Church; which testified its sense of his merits by electing him to the Moderator's chair the year after the disruption.

Aug. 26. Burned to death in London, by her dress taking fire, Miss Grey, eldest dau. of Sir C. Grey, late Supreme Judge of Calcutta.

June 1. At St. James's-pl., aged 47, Edward Grimes, esq., late Auditor-Gen. of Victoria, Melbourne.

Dec. 16. At Berlin, aged 73, Wilhelm Grimm, the younger of the two eminent brothers whose united efforts have so vastly contributed to the knowledge of German antiquity, German folk-lore, and the history of the German language.

He was born the year after his brother Jacob, at Hanau, and was engaged for many years first as Assistant-Librarian, and then as Professor at the University of Göttingen. Being one of those ardent patriots who protested against the arbitrary overthrow of the Hanoverian Constitution in 1837, he was deprived of his office and banished. He retired to Cassel; but in 1841 the liberality of the King of Prussia opened to him, and to

his brother also, a new sphere of activity at the University of Berlin. The great work of the two brothers—a Dictionary of the German Language of portentous comprehensiveness—is still unfinished, and may perhaps occupy the lives of several successors; but Wilhelm Grimm's "Kinder-und-Haus-märchen" are familiar guests at every German fireside, and in many a household of foreign countries where the Teutonic traditions and fancies are part of the national character.

April 10. At Ipswich, aged 81, C. Gross, esq., solicitor; Treasurer for the Ipswich division of the county of Suffolk 13 years; Coroner for Suffolk 29 years; and Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for 60 years.

Oct. 26. At the Royal Mews, Buckingham-palace, aged 56, Major John R. Groves, Crown Equerry.

July 23. At the Baths of Lucca, Italy, Mrs. Haig, of Bemersyde.

Oct. 6. At his residence, Bank House, Pontefract-lane, aged 80, Henry Hall, esq., senior magistrate of Leeds, and a deputy-lieut. of the West Riding.

June 6. At Osmington Lodge, near Weymouth, aged 63, Charles Hall, esq.

Jan. 21. Perhaps no year has been so remarkable as the present for the number of eminent literary characters that have been taken from us. This Obituary will contain biographical sketches of men so remarkable as Hallam, Macaulay, Prescott, Washington Irving, Leigh Hunt, and Elphinstone, who have departed within its brief circle.

Henry Hallam, the historian of the Middle Ages, of the British Constitution, and of the Revival of Literature, died at Pickhurst, Kent, on the 21st January, at the ripe age of 82. There are few literary men who have reached an eminence to be compared with that of Mr. Hallam, of whose personal history so little is known to the general public. Beyond the publication of his great works, his life was singularly uneventful. He was born at Windsor in 1777, the son of a dignitary of the Church, the Dean of Bristol. His family was good and ancient. One of its members was Bishop of Salisbury, and represented the English clergy in the Council of Constance, 1414. He was sent to Eton at an early age, where he was soon eminent among his contemporary students, and some of his earliest productions are to be found in the "Musæ Etonenses." From Eton he went to Christ Church, Oxford, where he again distin-

DEATHS.

guished himself by his extensive acquaintance with classical literature—a reputation which Byron has made lasting by describing him in his wrath as “classic Hallam, much renowned for Greek.” The most noticeable personal anecdote of this period of his life is an unfortunate accident which happened to him during an excursion in Ireland: he fell from the top of a cliff at Killarney, broke his leg, and was lamed for life. On leaving Oxford, he made London his residence, and, becoming an intimate of the great Whig families, gave his valuable assistance in establishing the *Edinburgh Review*, and it was his connection with this periodical that led Byron to associate him with the other *condottieri* of the pen in his satire of “English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.” Having at Eton and Oxford obtained a large mastery over the ancients, Hallam now devoted his studies to the acquisition of a knowledge of the European languages of importance to an acquaintance with the state of Europe during the Middle Ages. He married a daughter of Sir Abraham Elton, of Clevedon, in Somersetshire, and in the full possession of domestic repose set himself steadfastly to his task. In 1818 he gave to the world the first great result of his labours, his “View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages,” a work not merely of vast labour and research, but displaying the greatest sagacity in judgment, power of thought, and thorough conscientiousness, and, moreover, that vigour and perspicuity of expression which have made his works classic. Nine years later he published his “Constitutional History of England,” the most popular, and probably the greatest, of the three histories which have placed him among the noblest of English authors. Nothing can be more masterly than the manner in which he has traced the history of the English constitution from its first faint beginnings to its perfect development. His book is a vast treasury of political thought—an armoury of political facts; in itself a *Magna Charta* of our liberties and rights. The industry and research with which the vast field of English history is travelled over, the acuteness with which the minutest facts are seized on and turned to their just account, are only equalled by the soundness with which the deductions are made. Above all, in a department of literature which is more than any other exposed to controversy, the perfect integrity and singleness of purpose which

are conspicuous throughout, are beyond praise, and have given to the “Constitutional History” the rank of an original authority. On its first appearance it was assailed by the *Quarterly Review* with singular bitterness. The critic was known or reported to be Southey, who attacked in his review the Whig principles of Hallam’s associates rather than the conclusions of the historian. Those bad and bitter times passed away; the *Quarterly* has long since made amends; and the world of letters and of statesmanship have long separated Hallam from mere parties, and classed him where he ought to have been placed at first—among the few who in the world of political passions and events have preserved the untroubled serenity of judges. This great work completed, Mr. Hallam turned his powers to an inquiry into the literature of the period whose national and political history he had made so intelligible. But in the midst of his labours a great calamity fell on the retired student. His union had been blessed by two sons and two daughters. The eldest-born, Arthur Henry, was a youth of the highest promise. He had greatly distinguished himself at Oxford, was now studying the law, and had already taken honours in literature. He was, moreover, a youth of the most amiable qualities, and was truly loved by his friends—to his father he was a joy and pride. The youth died in the very blush of manly intellect. He died in 1833, and his bereaved father, laying him in the earth at Clevedon, recorded his worth in a private memoir, one of the most beautiful and tender offerings ever made to an unfulfilled promise. Tennyson also, the Poet Laureate, Arthur’s bosom friend, has erected the enduring monument of his many gifts in the exquisite series of poems entitled “In Memoriam.” The deep and lasting sorrow of the father found its solace in his beloved studies, and in a year or two after he completed and published the third of his great works, his “Introduction to the Literature of Europe.” Family affliction continued to lay a heavy hand on the now aged historian. One daughter first, and then his wife, had died; his hopes were now centred in the excellence of his remaining son, Henry Fitzmaurice, who, as he approached manhood, gave promise of a future, second only, in the old man’s eyes, to that so fondly anticipated and so cruelly blighted in his eldest-born. But he also died suddenly and mysteriously on the Continent in

DEATHS.

1850, at the age of 26; and the heart-broken father laid him also in that grave at Clevedon Church, beside his brother, and his sister, and his mother. The poor bereaved parent's wishes must have frequently turned to this sequestered spot as his thoughts repeated Tennyson's touching lines depicting the grave of his hopes:—

“And the stately ships go on
To the haven under the hill;
But oh! for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still.

“Break, break, break,
At the foot of thy crags, O sea!
But the tender grace of a day that is dead
Will never come back to me.”

Or that beautiful collection of images of stillness, solemnity, and order, in which the poet refers to the same place of rest:—

“The Danube to the Severn gave
The darkened heart that beat no more;
They laid him by the pleasant shore,
And in the hearing of the wave.

“There twice a day the Severn fills,
The salt sea water passes by,
And hushes half the babbling Wye,
And makes a silence in the hills.”

The last eight years of a life darkened by this astounding succession of bereavements were passed in quiet retirement, employed in the conscientious revision and completion of his great works; but the last days of the aged and now feeble philosopher were assiduously watched by the care of his only surviving child, the wife of Colonel Cator, with whom he lived until his decease, at Pickhurst, in Kent. His mind remained lucid, and occasionally even vigorous, to the last; and he continued to enjoy at times the society which the habits and circumstances of his life had rendered most congenial to him. He is buried at Clevedon with those whom he loved so well and so deeply lamented.

It is impossible, in this sketch, to attempt any critical account of the works which have placed Hallam among the first class of historic writers. But the various testimony which has accompanied the announcement of his decease unanimously declares his eminence. “Conscientious,” says *The Athenæum*, “to the point of pain, Hallam's appearance of vast reading is not deceptive. In his pages we have no vain parade of authorities. We

believe he never once cites a book without actual inspection of its contents; and where a fact of interest which he has learned from others orally comes directly in his way to state, he always writes it down with a qualification. No literary trick seemed to him more contemptible than citing books at second-hand. Another admirable feature in the great historian was his readiness to amend errors, and add new ideas and impressions from the labours of other men. In the various editions, his works were all annotated and improved with a most curious and conscientious skill. The last editions are the best. To his great work on the Middle Ages he published, in his 70th year, a thick volume of ‘Notes,’ in which he confessed to many mistakes of fact, and did ample justice to the eminent men who had followed so closely in the wake of his inquiries as to detect his wanderings to the right or the left. In the collected edition of his writings, published by Mr. Murray three or four years ago, in ten volumes, these ‘Notes’ are incorporated with the ‘View of the State of Europe,’ to which they added so many pleasant illustrations. The book is precious in every way; and not least among its uses to the future generation of Englishmen will be the light of a great and good example which it sets. In Hallam we possessed a scholar who loved truth better than fame.”

Another judicious biographer, writing in *The Times*, says, “Among historians we doubt whether there is to be found one equal to Mr. Hallam in impartiality. There have been historians as erudite as he, not less acute, more inspiring as thinkers, more elegant as writers; but for stern justice he is probably without a rival. His unflinching integrity, his subjugation of personal prejudices, his determination to speak the truth under all circumstances, is one of the rarest things in literature. This perfect frankness never takes in him the form, which it assumes in minds less accurately balanced, of an impatient desire to speak unpalatable truths in season and out of season. Perhaps there never was a critic who was so little of an egotist, and whose judgment was so little swayed by personal feelings, either of regard for himself or of regard for others. Here, indeed, one might detect a want in his character as a writer—a want which might scarcely have been observed when he began to write, but which became apparent in his later

DEATHS.

years, when the tendencies of the age had introduced a new style of history and of criticism. He belonged to that school which in history deals with principles rather than with persons, and in criticism deals with poems rather than with poets, books rather than with authors. The tendency of our literature of late years has been in a direction entirely opposite, and would seem to represent principles as subordinate to the personages by whom they are illustrated, books as but secondary to the authors from whose pens they have flowed—a tendency, in fact, which would render biography the base of history, the base of criticism, the base even of philosophy. So strongly has this tendency made itself manifest in our later literature that the peculiarity of Hallam's manner appears in most startling contrast, and those who have been nurtured under the more recent system may not be able to enjoy the dry details and impersonal reasonings of the old school. Mr. Hallam, however, in striving to be a classical historian, has shown but little ambition to be a popular one. His works are more for the student than the idle reader. The student finds in them a mine of wealth—unbounded erudition, accuracy that has never been impugned, a wise judgment that almost always leaves one satisfied, a brevity of statement that prevents exhaustion, and an elegance of style that draws him along. The reader for mere pleasure would never go through one of Mr. Hallam's works; and yet in all his writings there are passages instinct with fine feeling which might well fix the attention of the most desultory reader. Never writing for effect, but conscientiously and laboriously striving to elicit the bare truth, this great historian, whose works are as valuable as any of the same kind that have ever been written, often attains without seeking it an effect which the masters of popular applause might envy."

Although the writings of Hallam do not appear calculated to become popular, from the high nature of their themes, the abstruseness of the learning with which they are conversant, and the unknown regions of learning from whence the authorities are brought, yet such is their intrinsic value, and such the importance of the subjects on which they are at once the authority and the guide, that they have commanded the attention of the philosophical and accomplished student to an extent exceeding that of

many esteemed works of lighter literature, and it was thought desirable to popularize the last revised and perfected edition in the convenient form first adopted for the Waverley novels.

May 27. In Portman-sq., her Grace the Dowager Duchess of Hamilton, Brandon, and Chatelherault. The deceased duchess was the second daughter of William Beckford, of Fonthill Abbey, by the sister of the ninth Marquis of Huntly. She was born at the castle of La Tour, in Switzerland, in 1786, and married, in 1810, the tenth Duke of Hamilton.

July 11. At his residence, Bolton-row, Mayfair, aged 82, William Richard Hamilton, F.R.S., a gentleman of taste and learning, and, at one period of his life, holding a considerable public position.

He was educated at Harrow, and spent a short time both at Oxford and Cambridge; but an unfortunate accident in youth, which greatly impaired his physical strength, prevented him from residing long enough to take a degree. When the late Lord Elgin was appointed Ambassador to Constantinople, in 1799, Mr. Hamilton accompanied him as Attaché and Private Secretary. In the same year he was sent to Egypt on a diplomatic mission to the Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces, and on the expulsion of the French from that country he was employed in negotiating the terms of peace, by which they agreed to surrender all the works of art which they were on the point of carrying off to France. On this occasion Mr. Hamilton rendered a signal service to the lovers of Egyptian chronology in this country, and secured for the British Museum one of its most valuable treasures. Information having been received that the French had concealed in one of their transports the very remarkable trilingual Rosetta stone, he went on board the ship, though the plague had broken out in her, and obtained the valuable prize. A few years later, while returning to England in a vessel conveying the celebrated Elgin marbles to this country, he was shipwrecked on entering the port of Cerigo. In a few minutes the ship and the marbles went to the bottom, the crew only just saving their lives by jumping off the bowsprit on to the rocks. Mr. Hamilton remained in Cerigo several months, and, with the assistance of experienced divers, succeeded with great difficulty and perseverance in recovering these invaluable works of ancient Greek art from the sea. The publication of the

DEATHS.

"*Egyptiaca*," some time after his return to England, proved that he had not mis-spent his time in Egypt, since he had found the opportunity, in the intervals of official duties, to collect materials for a work containing a vast amount of new information respecting the antiquities of a country at that time but little known.

In 1804 Mr. Hamilton was appointed Private Secretary to the late Earl of Harrowby, and in the same year *précis* writer to Lord Mulgrave. In October, 1809, he became Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, which post he held during all the later years of the Great War, and until February, 1822, when he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Naples, where he remained till the beginning of 1825.

In 1815 he accompanied Lord Castlereagh to Paris, and it was chiefly owing to his exertions that the Bourbon Government consented to restore to Italy the works of art which the French had on various occasions removed to Paris. The cordial reception which he met with on visiting Italy a few years later, proved how highly the Italians, and especially the illustrious Canova, with whom he had established a footing of great intimacy and friendship, appreciated his efforts on their behalf.

Mr. Hamilton's acknowledged taste in art, sound criticism, and general character and attainments, led to his being appointed in 1838 to be one of the elected Trustees of the British Museum; for many years he took a leading part in the deliberations and proceedings of this body, until his failing health warned him of the necessity of withdrawing himself still more from those active duties in which he had till then loved to indulge. He resigned his trusteeship in February, 1858.

In 1833 Mr. Hamilton was one of those scientific and learned men who established the Royal Geographical Society, of which he was President during several years. He likewise devoted much of his time and thoughts to the Royal Institution, the Royal Society of Literature, and to the Dilettanti Society, of which last he was one of the most zealous and active members till the period of his last illness.

Sept. 24. At Clarence-terr., Leamington, aged 53, Mary Georgina Hampden, wife of John Hampden, esq., and sister of the late Sir Edmund Filmer, M.P., of East Sutton-pl., Maidstone.

Jan. 31. The Hon. Edward Handcock, youngest son of Lord Castlemaine. While tiger hunting in India, the enraged animal, it appears, attacked him, and inflicted such bodily injuries that he lived but for an hour after his release from her fangs. Captain Handcock was but 24 years of age, had served with distinction with his regt., the 44th, throughout the Crimean campaign, and had represented Athlone, his native town, in Parliament, during the session of 1856. At the time of his death he was attached to the staff of Lord Harris, Governor of Madras.

July 28. At Stapleford Park, near Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, aged 62, Robert Sherard, sixth Earl of Harborough; only son of the fifth Earl, by Eleanor, dau. of the Hon. J. Monckton; he succeeded to the titles and the large estates in 1807. His lordship married, in 1843, Mary Eliza, dau. of Capt. E. D. Temple, by whom he has no issue, and the earldom becomes extinct. The Irish barony of Sherard, however, devolves to his cousin, Philip Castell Sherard, of Glatton, near Stilton.

Aug. 18. Accidentally killed by falling over a precipice in the Pyrenees, aged 39, the Ven. Charles Hardwick, M.A., Archdeacon of Ely.

The deceased was born at Slingsby, near Malton, in Yorkshire, in 1820, in humble circumstances; he started in life with no advantages of birth, or wealth, or education; yet, with natural talents not of the highest order, he honourably won the high position which he had attained at an early age by patient industry and the diligent improvement of the opportunities which were presented to him. It was his good fortune to enter at St. Catherine's Hall in 1840, when Dr. Corrie, the present Master of Jesus College, was tutor there. He won the esteem of his tutor by his diligence and his amiable conduct, and received from him more than the usual instruction. The publication of several small works raised his reputation; and in 1851 he published the first edition of his "*History of the Articles of Religion*," a very remarkable work for so young a man, which probably procured for him the appointment of Whitehall Preacher, with which he was honoured by the late Bishop of London, in the same year. In 1853 he was appointed Professor of Theology in Queen's College, Birmingham, but only held the appointment for about six months. In the same year he also published his

DEATHS.

"History of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages," in a very valuable series of theological manuals, issued by Messrs. Macmillan. This was followed in 1856 by the work on the period of the Reformation. In this interval he had been appointed Divinity Lecturer at King's College, Cambridge, early in 1855—which office he held, with great advantage to the College, until the time of his death—and in the same year was elected Christian Advocate in the University, and published the first of the annual volumes required by the conditions of the office, which he entitled "Christ and other Masters," being "an historical inquiry into some of the chief parallelisms and contrasts between Christianity and the religious systems of the ancient world." This work was intended to cover a space in the history of religion, which no man, except perhaps Gibbon, could have completed in his lifetime; and it is not completed: but out of it grew other smaller works of great value. Mr. Hardwick also edited for the University some of the great works which have issued from their press.

But it is not only as a literary man that Mr. Hardwick's loss will be severely felt in the University and in the Church. Ever foremost in works of Christian benevolence, he was especially active in the cause of home and foreign missions. His lively and intelligent interest in the affairs of the University secured him a place in the Council of the Senate, when it was first instituted in 1856, and on the expiration of the term of his tenure of office, he was re-elected in 1858. His appointment to the Archdeaconry of Ely at the beginning of this year gave almost universal satisfaction in the diocese, and he had already set himself to his new duties with his accustomed energy. He left England, at the beginning of the long vacation, for a short tour in the Pyrenees, accompanied by an English gentleman whom he had met at Bagnères de Luchon. On the 18th August they ascended a mountain near the Port de Venasque. They reached the summit safely, and had made part of the descent, when unfortunately Archdeacon Hardwick proposed taking a different path from that by which they had ascended. His companion, however, preferred keeping to the known track, and reached the foot of the mountain in safety. After waiting long for the Archdeacon, his previous companion became alarmed, and especially as he was told by some shepherds that the descent attempted by Mr. Hard-

wick was impracticable. All attempts to trace Mr. Hardwick on that day were fruitless; but, a strong body of guides and police having been procured from Bagnères de Luchon, another search made early on the following morning resulted in the discovery of the unfortunate gentleman's body. He appeared to have achieved the most difficult parts of the descent, and then to have fallen down a shelving mass of rock, through a distance of about 200 feet. He must have been killed instantaneously, as the skull was found split, his left arm was broken in two places, and his watch shattered to pieces. His remains were buried with every mark of respect, by the care of the Commissary of Police, in the cemetery of Luchon, about three feet from the marble bust of a Mr. Cunninghame.

Nov. 8. At Goldsbrough Hall, Knaresborough, in her 59th year, the Countess Dowager of Harewood, second dau. of Thomas, second Marquis of Bath, K.G. Her ladyship married, on the 5th of July, 1823, Henry, third Earl of Harewood, who died in 1857 from the effects of injuries sustained by being thrown from his horse in the hunting field. The Countess leaves numerous issue.

March 1. At Ebury-st., Pimlico, Elizabeth Pritt Harley, the surviving sister of the famous comedian, of Upper Gower-st., surviving her brother only six months.

Oct. 12. At Chevington, Frances Harris, a reputed witch, who was probably not less than 103 years old.

March 29. At Grosvenor-sq., the Countess of Harrowby. The deceased Countess was dau. of John, first Marquis of Bute, by his second marriage with Frances, second dau. of Mr. Thomas Coutts, and was sister of the late Lord Dudley Stuart. Her ladyship was married, in 1823, to the Earl of Harrowby, then Viscount Sandon.

April 24. At Samer, near Boulogne-sur-Mer, aged 43, Alicia, wife of Sir Brodrick Hartwell, bart.

Dec. 27. In London, in his 63rd year, Jacob Astley, Lord Hastings, and a bart.

The deceased peer was the eldest son of Sir Jacob Henry Astley, fifth bart. He succeeded to the baronetcy and large estates in Norfolk and Northumberland on the demise of his father, in 1817, and represented the Western division of Norfolk, in the Liberal interest, from 1832 up to 1837, he and his ancestors having sat in no less than twenty-one Parliaments for the county.

DEATHS.

Sir Jacob married, on the 22nd of March, 1819, Georgiana Caroline, youngest dau. of the late Sir Henry W. Dashwood, bart., by whom he leaves issue. In 1841 Sir Jacob was summoned to the House of Peers, in the ancient Barony of Hastings, being one of the heirs of John Hastings, by his co-heiress, Elizabeth, the barony having been nearly 400 years in abeyance.

Feb. 8. Rear-Adm. Villiers Francis Hatton. In 1808, while serving as Lieut. of the *Seagull*, 16, Adm. Hatton shared in the heroic action of two hours and a half with the Danish brig *Longen*, and several large gunboats. After the *Seagull* had lost one-third of her crew, killed or wounded, and was reduced almost to a sinking state, the officers and crew were compelled to surrender to the enemy. Lieut. Hatton lost an arm in the contest, and received other dangerous wounds. For the gallantry he displayed on that occasion he was promoted to the rank of Commander, his commission being antedated to the date of the action with the enemy. Adm. Hatton enjoyed a pension of 300*l.* for his wounds.

May 28. At Leith Hall, Lady Leith Hay, of Rannes.

May 7. At Cheltenham, aged 74, Maj.-Gen. Edward Hay, late Commandant of the East India Military Depot, Warley, Essex.

Oct. 14. In Canada, aged 19, John Head, esq., only son of Sir Edmund Walker Head, bart., Governor-General of the Canadas. "His Excellency, Lady Head, Miss Head, and Mr. John Head, with a distinguished party, left Three Rivers on Tuesday morning last to visit the River St. Maurice as far as the Piles Falls. The trip was entirely successful until yesterday morning, when Mr. John Head, son of his Excellency, was unfortunately drowned while bathing in the immediate vicinity of the falls of the Grande Mere."

Sept. 7. At Turnham Green, Professor Henfrey, Fellow of the Royal and Linnean Societies, a Member of the Council of the Horticultural Society, &c., Professor of Botany in King's College, London, and Examiner in Natural Science to the Royal Military Academy and the Society of Arts. Arthur Henfrey was the third son of Henry Antram Henfrey, esq., and was born November 1, 1820, at Aberdeen; married, 26th August, 1851, Elizabeth Anne, eldest daughter of Jabez Henry, esq., Supreme Judge of Demerara, &c., by which

VOL. CI.

lady, who survives him, he leaves four sons. Professor Henfrey has long been known as an excellent histologist, and sound vegetable physiologist. Especially conversant with the botanical literature of the Germans, we owe to his pen many valuable dissertations upon subjects little attended to in England. The papers in the "Micrographic Dictionary" written by him, in conjunction with Dr. Griffith, are celebrated for their accuracy, as well as skilful condensation. The physiological part of his "Elementary Course of Botany," and the papers on "Vegetable Structure" now in course of publication in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, will always be regarded as the productions of a man not only familiar with the truths of science, but able to render them attractive to those who are little accustomed to think upon such subjects. In private life he was endeared to his friends by the gentleness of his manners and the genuine kindness of his nature; and by his relations and family he will be long and deeply mourned, and to his children his loss is irreparable, as he was ever an indulgent and fond father, and their constant companion.

Oct. 9. Suddenly, at the house of his friend, Mr. Samuel Blackwell, Dudley, aged 48, Thomas Hetherington Henry, F.R.S., F.C.S., &c., member of several foreign scientific societies, an eminent analytical chemist and assayer, author of many papers published in the Transactions of the Royal Society, &c. Mr. Henry was the second son of the late Hon. Jabez Henry, first English President of Demerara, and first Supreme Judge of the Ionian Islands, &c., and was for many years superintendent at Messrs. Hanbury and Buxton's brewery, previous to which he commenced the first analyses of food, &c., which were published in the *Lancet* in 1837, and he has followed the profession of analytical chemist with great reputation since 1850, when, in July last, he received a sun-stroke, from which his constitution never rallied, and which has now snatched him from his sorrowing family and a large circle of admiring friends, only one month after the death of his lamented brother-in-law, Prof. Arthur Henfrey.

Oct. 7. At Rocliffe, Leicestershire, aged 63, Isabella, widow of Sir Wm. Heygate, bart.

Nov. 26. At Brixton, aged 94, Mr. C. W. Hicks, Sword Bearer to the City of London.

F F

DEATHS.

Feb. 13. At Cliftonville, Brighton, aged 70, Ann Hindmarsh, sister of Rear-Adm. Sir John Hindmarsh.

April 2. At Cliftonville, Brighton, aged 72, Susanna Wilson, the wife of Rear-Adm. Sir John Hindmarsh.

March 18. At Lecford House, Budleigh Salterton, aged 82, John Hine, esq., late of the Bombay Medical Establishment, and for many years attached to the Residency at Bagdad. He has bequeathed to the Devon and Exeter Hospital 10,000*l.*; to the Deaf and Dumb Asylum 3,000*l.*; to the Blind Asylum 3,000*l.*; to the North Devon Infirmary 6,000*l.*; to the Exeter Penitentiary 2,000*l.*; to the Exeter Dispensary 1,000*l.*; to the Exeter Eye Infirmary 1,000*l.*; to the East Budleigh Salterton National Schools 1,000*l.*; to the poor of the parish of East Budleigh 1,000*l.*; to the Benevolent Fund of that parish 1,000*l.*; to the Medical Benevolent Fund 3,000*l.*; to the Royal Medical Benevolent College 3,000*l.*; and other sums for various benevolent objects.

May 18. Madame Hoche, widow of the celebrated Republican General, the "pacificator" of La Vendée, and who attempted a descent in Bantry Bay in 1796, died at Versailles, at an advanced age.

Nov. 20. At Ayr, by an accident, William H. M. Hodder, esq., Colonel of the North Cork Rifles, now quartered at that town. The deceased was a deputy-lieutenant of the county of Cork. He served in the Peninsular war in the Eighty-eighth Connaught Rangers, and was present at the battles of Talavera, Busaco, and Fuentes d'Onor, the affair of Fox d'Arouce and Sabugal, and lines of Torres Vedras, for which he received a medal and three clasps.

Oct. 27. In the wreck of the *Royal Charter*, the Rev. Charles Vere Hodge, M.A., Vicar of Clarbrough, near Retford.

Mr. Hodge was a native of Taunton, in Somersetshire, where he was born in 1807. Having received the rudiments of his education at school, he was, in due course of time, entered at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Here he remained about the usual period, and graduated in 1830. Leaving college, he selected the legal profession for his pursuit. He commenced practising his profession in the city of Oxford, and for some time appeared to be attaining to considerable eminence. Amongst other situations he was elected clerk to the magistrates, &c.,

but in the course of a few years, from conviction and conscientious motives, he resolved upon relinquishing the profession of the law, and of entering upon the more sacred duties of the Church. This he easily accomplished, and was soon afterwards ordained by the Bishop of Oxford. Some time subsequently he took up his residence with his paternal uncle, the Rev. Matthew Hodge, M.A., of Fillingham, Lincolnshire, who was rector of that place, and vicar of Ing-ham, and also rural dean of the district. Soon after this he married Ann, third daughter of the late John Kirke, esq., of East Retford, by Ann Mervyn, daughter of Sir William Richardson, bart., of Angher, co. Tyrone, by whom he had seven sons and three daughters, all of whom survive except a son and daughter who died in their infancy. For a short period Mr. Hodge was curate of Sturton, near Retford, and in 1842 he was presented to the perpetual curacy of Scofton, near Worksop, by George Savile Foljambe, esq., by whom the deceased was held in high estimation. In 1844, on the removal of the Rev. J. W. Brooks from the vicarage of Clarbrough to that of St. Mary's, Nottingham, Mr. Hodge was presented by Simeon's trustees to the living of Clarbrough, which soon afterwards obliged him to resign the preferment at Scofton, and take up his residence at Clarbrough.

Nov. 22. At his residence, Lower Craven-place, Kentish Town, Henry Geo. Holden, esq., late Assistant Keeper (first class) in the Public Record Office.

Dec. 18. At Naples, in his 58th year, Henry Edward Fox, Baron Holland of Holland, co. Lincoln, and Baron Holland of Foxley, co. Wilts, in the peerage of Great Britain. His lordship was the only son of Henry, third Baron, by his marriage with Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. Richard Vassall, and married in 1833 Lady Mary Augusta Coventry, only daughter of the late Earl of Coventry. The late lord entered the diplomatic service in July, 1831, and was for some time Attaché to the Embassy at St. Petersburg, whence he was removed in 1832 to Turin as Secretary of Legation. In July, 1835, he proceeded to Vienna, in a similar capacity, and continued there till April, 1838, when he was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary to the Germanic Confederation. Having held that post up to December the same year, he was removed to Florence, where he was Resi-

DEATHS.

dent Minister up to June, 1846; when, on vacating that post at the Court of Tuscany, he retired altogether from diplomatic duties. On the death of his father in October, 1840, he succeeded to the title and family estates. His lordship not leaving any issue the barony becomes extinct; but his only sister, Lady Lilford, succeeds to the family estates.

March 25. At her residence, Regency-sq., Brighton, aged 88, the Hon. Frances Holland, widow of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Holland, Precentor of Chichester, and formerly Rector of Poyning, Sussex, and dau. of the late Thomas Lord Erskine.

Oct. 9. At Suffolk-place, aged 69, Rear-Admiral William Holt. The deceased officer was very actively engaged during the French war, and commanded a rocket-boat at Copenhagen in 1807.

July 24. At his residence, Chalcott-villes, Camden-town, aged 86, Thomas Horsfield, M. et Ph. D., F.R.S., &c., Keeper of the Museum, India-house.

Jan. 31. The Lady Frances Hotham, eldest dau. of the late Earl of Stradbroke, and widow of Vice-Admiral the Hon. Sir Henry Hotham, K.C.B., G.C.M.G.

Nov. 28. At Bathwick-hill, the Hon. Mrs. H. Howard, widow of the Hon. Capt. H. T. Howard, and eldest dau. of Sir John W. Guise, bart., of Rendcombe-park, Gloucestershire.

Jan. 2. At Romanby-house, near Northallerton, aged 49, Frances, wife of R. G. Hubback, esq., third dau. of Lord Charles Kerr, of Farnham, Surrey, and grand-dau. of William John, fifth Marquis of Lothian.

April 13. At his residence, Euston-sq., aged 93, Col. Robert John Hudleston, H.E.I.C.S.

May 2. At Cleve-lodge, Downend, aged 59, John Hughes, esq., J.P. and Deputy-Lieut. for the co. of Gloucester.

Sept. 8. At Islington, aged 87, Joseph Hugh Hughes, surgeon in the Royal Navy. The deceased was grandson and heir of George Baron Sempill and Elliotstown, of Renfrew, N.B., whose titles and estates were forfeited as a consequence of the great Rebellion of 1745.

May 5. At Berlin, Frederic Henry Alexander Humboldt. He was born at Berlin on the 14th of September, 1769; consequently, in the September of the present year he would, had he lived, have completed ninety years of existence. Humboldt was descended from an ancient

Pomeranian family; but the brilliancy of the intellectual brothers, William and Alexander, eclipsed the lesser lights of their ancestors, notwithstanding that they possess a traditional greatness in the history of the wars of their country.

Major Humboldt, the father, was aide-de-camp to the Duke of Brunswick during the Seven Years' War; and he became, on the return of peace, Chamberlain to the King of Prussia. The mother, who is described as being a very remarkable woman, full of intellectual power, and of elastic spirits, was first married to a Baron Holwede, and in 1767 became the wife of Major Humboldt, and by him the mother of two sons, who were destined to achieve the highest honours which are within the range of the human mind. The early education of those children was the constant care of the intellectual mother; and in their château at Tegel, near Berlin, they received those first impressions which served to develop their native powers, and which to the last guided the labours of him who has just passed away from among us.

The scholastic education of the two youths was of the highest order. At Berlin, though they do not appear to have studied at the University, they were placed under the instruction of the ablest professors. The well-known Willdenow instructed them in botany; and their studies in philosophy and political economy were directed by D'Engel, Klein, and Dohm. The years 1786 to 1788 were passed at the University of Frankfurt; and towards the end of the latter year Humboldt proceeded to Göttingen, which was at that time rendered remarkable in Europe by the impulse given by Blumenbach, Heine, and Eichhorn to the study of the natural sciences, and of philology and history.

The first practical direction given to Humboldt's genius was due to an Englishman, George Forster, a companion of Cook in his second voyage. The result of numerous excursions with this gentleman in his native country was a geological treatise on the basalt of the Rhine.

For the purpose of rendering himself familiar with foreign languages, Alexander Humboldt went from Göttingen to Hamburg, where he spent some time. From thence he removed to the Academy of Freiberg, having for this purpose especially obtained the consent of his mother to study under the celebrated Werner,

F F 2

who was at this time warring with those philosophers who referred all geological phenomena to igneous action. With Werner Humboldt was an especial favourite; and with Werner for his master, and Leopold von Buch, with whom he formed an intimacy, for his guide, he completed those studies which subsequently fitted him to hold office in the administration of mines in the principalities of Beyreuth and Anspach. While holding this office Humboldt collected the materials for his works on the Fossil Flora. His studies also extended to the nervous and muscular irritation of animal organisms; his experiments and conclusions being published in his "*Über die Gereizte nerveuse et musculaire*," &c., published during 1797 and 1799, which excited considerable attention both in this country and in France.

The death of his mother in 1796 gave him freedom for a career he had long cherished—a great exploring expedition, and he devoted himself intensely to those studies which would most effectually aid him. He associated himself with Leopold von Buch, and devoted his time entirely to the study of meteorological phenomena. He then proceeded to Paris, to collect the best meteorological instruments, and to improve still further, under the direction of the members of the Institute of France, his powers of observation and his experimental capabilities. Having disposed of his property in Prussia, and secured from the French authorities permission to join the Baudin expedition, which was fitting out for the survey of South America, with the privilege of disembarking wherever he chose, he prepared to quit the Old World for the great field of the New, then, as far as natural science was concerned, entirely unexplored. During his sojourn in Paris he met the future companion of his travels, M. Aimé Bonpland, a young man full of enthusiasm, and thirsting for discoveries which the Old World appeared to deny him. The consent of the Spanish Government having been obtained, after various adventures Humboldt and his companion landed at Cumana in July, 1799.

Humboldt's first experience of an earthquake was in this town, which he made the centre of his operations during some months devoted to the survey of the State of Venezuela. The advantages of his early studies were now apparent: in his published accounts of this exploration we have the first satisfactory description of these

terrible phenomena of nature, given with a degree of care which was due entirely to the inductive training to which he had been subjected in his youth.

With Bonpland our adventurous traveller navigated in an Indian canoe, during seventy-five days of continuous exertion, the Orinoco, the Rio Negro, and other great rivers of the northern division of South America, reaching in June, 1800, the town of Angostura, where they rested from the extreme fatigue of this hazardous voyage. Their observations were most extensive, embracing astronomical determinations, terrestrial surveys, researches on the botany, mineralogy, and geology of the States through which they passed; and, in addition, their notices of the manners and the customs of the natives were marked by a shrewd philosophy and acute powers of observation. From Cumana the travellers proceeded to Havanna, where they stopped several months, employing their leisure in teaching the inhabitants the process of making sugar, and informing them in many of the useful arts which had not hitherto been introduced amongst them. From Havanna they were induced to make an attempt to join Capt. Baudin, commander of the French expedition, which they had contemplated joining. He was suspected to be on the western coast of South America, but the information was doubtful; and having failed in their first attempt to reach Carthagena for the purpose of passing from thence to Panama,—principally owing to the severity of the season,—they abandoned the attempt.

Launching themselves, however, on the Amazon, they navigated the waters of that mighty river for fifty-four days, and having traversed the ever-varying regions washed by it, and so graphically described by the travellers, they reached Quito on the 6th of January, 1802. Their exploration of this district was most complete; they devoted nearly six months to the labour, and they made on the 23rd of June the celebrated ascent of Chimborazo, the summit of which is 21,420 feet above the level of the sea.

From Quito the travellers proceeded to Peru, and rested some days at Lima, and from thence they made their way to Mexico, where they arrived in the month of April, 1803. For the remainder of that year they were employed in examining the State of Mexico and the surrounding provinces; Humboldt's survey being

DEATHS.

carried out with an accuracy which has never been excelled.

In March, 1804, Humboldt returned to Havanna, to complete the collection of material for his work on the island of Cuba, and having effected his object, he visited Philadelphia and Washington, and returned to the Old Continent, reaching Bourdeaux on the 3rd of August. Humboldt hastened to Paris, and having obtained from the Prussian Government permission to remain in that city until the completion of his work,—which could not, at that time, be executed in Germany,—he remained there until the end of 1827, when the great work of Alexander Humboldt and Aimé Bonpland, "The Voyage to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent," made its appearance.

The collections brought home by Humboldt were the most extensive and the best selected which had ever reached Europe, and the observations by far the most accurate. These were submitted to scientific men of the time, and the value of their work was greatly enhanced by the contributions of Arago, Gay-Lussac, Cuvier, Latreille, Vauquelin, and Klaproth. Humboldt's own division of the work is an example of the highest order of scientific literature, exact to minuteness in all the details, graphic and remarkably clear in the descriptive portions, and frequently rising into a fine poetry, where the enthusiasm of the author is excited by the remembrances of some of the grandest scenes in nature, observed by him under the most varied aspects. It was not until 1827 that Humboldt was induced to leave France, and to quit the society of Arago, Cuvier, Gay-Lussac, with his other learned friends, who continually held out every inducement to chain him to France. In the meantime, Humboldt commenced that work which he has hung over with an almost childish love—his "Cosmos,"—and it may be said that he died full of the contemplation of the physical phenomena of the universe, which forms the subject. In 1812 the Russian Government invited Humboldt to visit the Russian possessions in Asia, and the King of Prussia offered to contribute to the expenses of the expedition 50,000 francs annually. At this time, owing to the political state of Europe, the expedition was abandoned, to be resumed, however, in 1829; when the Czar Nicholas proposed to meet individually all the expenses of the expedition. The pro-

position was accepted by Humboldt, and having associated himself with MM. Rose and Ehrenberg, and M. Menschenin, a Russian, who acted as interpreter, he commenced his second great journey of scientific exploration, charging himself with all the astronomical, magnetic, geognostic, and physical observations.

The details of this expedition will be found in M. Rose's work, "Mineralogische-Geognostische Reise nach dem Ural dem Altai und dem Kaspischen Meer," published at Berlin, 1837-1842, and Humboldt's work, "Asie Centrale, Recherches sur les Chaînes de Montagnes, et la Climatologie comparée," published at Paris in 1843.

From 1830 to 1848 Humboldt resided alternately in Berlin and Paris, and his judgment was so highly appreciated by Frederick William III., that he was intrusted with several very important political missions. In 1835 Alexander Humboldt was severely afflicted by the loss of his brother William,—a shock which he never entirely recovered,—and he from that period gradually withdrew from public life, finding refuge in the silent contemplation of the scenes which remained pictured upon the mysterious tablets of memory.

In 1848 Humboldt quitted France, and lived from this time in close intimacy with the King of Prussia; and, notwithstanding his advanced years, he was consulted equally upon political questions and on the subjects connected with science which were from time to time entertained by the Prussian Government.

The great works which recounted his exploration in the New World and in Central Asia have been named; but Humboldt gave to the world the results of an ever active mind in numerous publications, each of which from any other man would have established a reputation—such as his "Astronomical Observations," the "Geographical Distribution of Plants," the "Distribution of Heat on the Globe." His reputation in England was, however, based on his American travels, his "Aspects of Nature," and his "Cosmos."

"Europe," says *The Athenæum*, "has lost in Alexander Humboldt one of its greatest men, and science one of its most earnest cultivators and most influential benefactors." From his position in Prussia, and from the respect which his opinion commanded with all the monarchs of Europe, a recommendation from Hum-

DEATHS.

boldt was certain of being seriously entertained, and for the last half-century he has been connected with almost every extensive inquiry which has been undertaken. As a philosopher, Humboldt displayed powers of a very high order; as a man, he was beloved by all who came within the sphere of his influence, and he was respected in Berlin and Potsdam by the people to a degree amounting to veneration. Humboldt's passionate love of nature was reflected in its influences upon every movement of his long life. He has proved that powerful mental exertion and active bodily labour are, when united, most conducive to a long and happy existence. Alexander Humboldt has passed into eternity; may his works, which are his noblest monument, stimulate other adventurers to follow in the footsteps of one who so completely fulfilled the great purposes of an intellectual existence, and secured its own exceeding great reward!"

The corpse of the illustrious philosopher, after lying in state, was buried with a funereal pomp rarely accorded to the highest nobles—perhaps never before accorded to a man of letters. He was interred by the side of his brother Wilhelm, under a granite column, in the grounds of his residence at Tegel.

Aug. 28. At the house of Charles Reynell, esq., Putney, aged 74, the popular writer, Leigh Hunt.

Leigh Hunt, or rather James Henry Leigh Hunt, for that was his full baptismal designation, was born in Southgate, Middlesex, on the 19th October, 1784, in the midst of "the truly English scenery" which he loved before all other. His father, a "Barbadian born," had been an American barrister in Philadelphia, but adhering to the Royalist side at the Revolution, was driven back to the old country. In England the American barrister became a clergyman. He also became tutor to Mr. Leigh, nephew of the Duke of Chandos.

Leigh Hunt was educated at Christ's Hospital. Coleridge and Lamb, afterwards his associates and friends, left the school not long before he entered it. He received at this institution a sound, healthy, classical training, of which he always spoke and wrote with respect. Shortly after he left school he published a volume of juvenile verses, which gave little promise of his matured powers. His first appearance as a critic and essayist was in the *Traveller*, an evening paper.

In the year 1805 his brother, John Hunt, set up a paper called the *News*, to which Leigh Hunt became theatrical critic, and startled the town by his independent, scholarly criticism.

In 1808 Leigh Hunt and his brother John set up the *Examiner*. Its objects were "to assist in producing Reform in Parliament, liberality of opinion in general (especially freedom from superstition), and a fusion of literary taste into all subjects whatsoever."

Before becoming the editor of the *Examiner*, Leigh Hunt had been appointed a clerk in the War-office; but he soon resigned the situation. Indeed, his uncompromising opposition to the Court and the Ministry would have compelled the step if his own disinclination for office drudgery had not dictated it. In 1809, the second year of his editorship, he got married.

In his newspaper life he soon became acquainted with the leading literary men of the time: Thomas Campbell, Theodore Hook, Matthews, James and Horace Smith, and many others, with all of whom Leigh Hunt, bright-eyed, young, eager, "gentle and not fearful," became a general favourite. The Hunts conducted their paper with a consistent adherence to the principles they advocated, but unfortunately in some cases with an acrimony which in these quiet times we cannot appreciate. They subjected themselves to prosecution in the case of Mrs. Clarke, and for an article on army flogging. These proved innocuous; but some papers on the Prince Regent brought upon them the full tide of the Attorney-General's wrath. It is worth while to preserve a specimen of the political feeling of that day.

The *Morning Post* had affected contempt for the guests at a public dinner where the Regent's health was received with hisses. The *Examiner* thus replied:—

"The same page, which contained the specimen of contempt above mentioned, contained also a set of wretched commonplace lines in French, Italian, Spanish, and English, *literally* addressing the Prince Regent in the following terms, among others:—'You are the *Glory of the people*,'—'You are the *Protector of the arts*,'—'You are the *Mecenas of the age*,'—'Wherever you appear you conquer all hearts, wipe away tears, excite desire and love, and win beauty towards you,'—'You breathe eloquence,'—'You

DEATHS.

inspire the Graces,—‘You are *Adonis in loveliness*.’

“What person, unacquainted with the true state of the case, would imagine, in reading these astounding eulogies, that this ‘*Glory of the people*’ was the subject of millions of shrugs and reproaches!—that this ‘*Protector of the arts*’ had named a wretched foreigner his historical painter, in disparagement or in ignorance of the merits of his own countrymen!—that this ‘*Mecenas of the age*’ patronized not a single deserving writer!—that this ‘*Breather of eloquence*’ could not say a few decent extempore words—if we are to judge, at least, from what he said to his regiment on its embarkation for Portugal—that this ‘*Conqueror of hearts*’ was the disappointment of hopes!—that this ‘*Exciter of desire*’ [bravo! Messieurs of the *Post*!], this ‘*Adonis in loveliness*’ was a corpulent man of fifty!—in short, that this *delightful, blissful, wise, pleasurable, honourable, virtuous, true, and immortal* prince, was a violator of his word, a libertine, over head and ears in disgrace, a despiser of domestic ties, the companion of gamblers and demireps, a man who has just closed half a century without one single claim on the gratitude of his country, or the respect of posterity.”

For this article, which appeared in May, 1812, Leigh Hunt and his brother John were indicted, convicted, and sentenced to two years’ imprisonment, in separate prisons, and each to pay a fine of 500*l*. Leigh Hunt was imprisoned in Horsemonger-lane Gaol, one of the old-fashioned dreary buildings, wretched in every way. He was soon allowed, however, to purchase alleviations; and when, on account of ill-health, he was removed into the infirmary, he made his rooms bright with pretty papering, but more with his own cheerfulness. Indeed, the buoyancy of Leigh Hunt’s spirits was such that nothing seemed to depress him; whatever the trouble it passed him unscathed; his cheerful light-heartedness never forsook him.

His wife and children were allowed to be with him, and his eldest daughter Mary (since dead) was born in prison. However lightened his prison time was by such company, and the troops of friends whom his martyrdom for truth brought around him, he suffered severely in mind (especially when the last summer of his stay his family removed to Brighton), and his bodily health never recovered the long

confinement. It confirmed in him a reluctance to stir about, which was partly the result of constitutional weakness, but which the two years’ habit made a second nature. He came out of prison in February, 1815. In this year he first became acquainted with Byron and with Wordsworth. He had defended Wordsworth in the *Examiner* from the attacks of his many critics.

In 1816 Leigh Hunt’s longest and most ambitious poem, the “*Story of Rimini*,” was published. The tale is the well-known one of Francesca of Rimini and Paolo, her husband’s brother, her own lover. The poem contains many passages of great beauty, and some—especially the tale of Francesca’s fall—impassioned.

Leigh Hunt at this time lived in Hampstead, where Shelley, who through life loved him with a brother’s love, first visited him. About this time also he first knew Keats.

After publishing some miscellaneous poems and translations in a volume entitled “*Foliage*,” Leigh Hunt started the *Indicator*. Of all the periodicals that for the last hundred years have taken up the rôle of Addison’s and Steele’s delightful serials, none was ever so successful. Leigh Hunt possessed all the requisites for editing such a paper; he was genial, scholarly, many-sided, and Catholic in taste.

In 1821 Leigh Hunt visited Italy, partly to recruit his health, partly to see Shelley, and with the intention of joining Shelley and Byron in a periodical called the *Liberal*. It was actually started; but the union came to a sad and bitter ending through the sudden death of Shelley and a quarrel with Lord Byron. Leigh Hunt incurred much odium some time after by publishing a volume (1828) in which Byron’s life in Italy was, perhaps, too frankly criticized. While residing at Florence, after the decease of the *Liberal*, Hunt translated Redi’s “*Bacco in Toscana*,” with a spirit and success surprising to many who had thought the original too Italian to fit easily or happily in any other dress.

On his return to England, Hunt went to live at Highgate (1828), and wrote here the greater part of *The Companion*—a series in continuation of the *Indicator*. He soon afterwards wrote (still in bad health) for *The True Sun*, an evening paper, in the office of which he first became acquainted with Laman Blanchard. He shortly after removed to

DEATHS.

Chelsea (where he met Thomas Carlyle), and set up *The London Journal*—a very successful precursor to such periodicals as *Chambers* and the *Household Words* of our own time. He lived for seven years in Chelsea, and wrote amongst other things, during his residence there, "Captain Sword and Captain Pen" (published 1835), a poem of considerable power, showing the horrors of war.

Leigh Hunt wrote in all five plays—*The Legend of Florence* (which had some success at its first appearance, but which was not fitted for the stage), *Lovers' Amusements*, which was acted within the last eighteen months at the Lyceum; and three other pieces, never acted.

From Chelsea, shortly after he received (1847) a pension of 200*l.* a year from the Queen, Leigh Hunt removed to Kensington, where he wrote the best of his critical productions—two volumes entitled "Wit and Humour" and "Imagination and Fancy." They were composed of extracts from the English literature of all time, interspersed with commentaries full of thought and fine taste. Of a somewhat similar kind was his "Book for a Corner" (1849), while in "The Town" (1848) he brought his genial wit to lighten antiquarian details. During the last seven years he resided at Hammersmith. Here he wrote "The Religion of the Heart" (1853), a manual of faith and duty—an attempt to suggest a ritual for unbogoted believers of all creeds—and "The Old Court Suburb" (1855), a pleasant history of Kensington. Amongst other literary works not already mentioned were "Men, Women, and Books; a Selection of Sketches, Essays, and Critical Memoirs," 1847; "A Jar of Honey from Mount Hybla" (a collection in prose and verse), 1848; the author's "Autobiography," in three volumes, 1850; a volume of "Table-Talk, with Imaginary Conversations of Pope and Swift," 1851; and a collection of "Stories in Verse," from the author's earlier writings, 1855. He wrote from time to time agreeable articles for *Household Words*. In later years he led a life quietly happy; denied the pleasure of rude health, he enjoyed himself in his own way, in his arm-chair, poring over a favourite volume, listening to an Italian song from his daughter, or chatting with some friend. When his last hour came, he died without pain, tended to the last by loving and familiar hands.

The place of Leigh Hunt as a writer

has been a subject much controverted. By his Tory foes he was thought a conceited fribble,—pre-eminently a cockney poet; by his admirers he was disproportionately lauded. The latter, however, have probably more of the right, for undoubtedly Leigh Hunt is a most agreeable writer. He touches everything with a happy vein of humour that is irresistible.

His personal character is likewise weighed in opposite scales of prejudice. His political career was undoubtedly consistent from first to last; but in the business part of life he too frequently became an object of reproach. His friends,—those who knew him well—he never failed to please, and he was to the last beloved by his circle; but that circle did know him *well*, and their love and affection were based on the good qualities that he *had*—those that he *had not* did not trouble them.

Jan. 21. In Cambridge-terr., Hyde-park, Janet, widow of Sir Claudius S. Hunter, bart., of Mortimer-hill, Reading.

June 25. Aged 23, Lieut. Henry L. T. Inglis, R.M.L.I.

Feb. 7. Aged 83, the Rev. James Inman, B.A. 1800, M.A. 1805, D.D. 1820, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, many years Professor of Mathematics at the Royal Naval College, and the School of Naval Architecture, Portsmouth. Dr. Inman was the oldest of Cambridge Senior Wranglers, his degree dating back as far as 1800, and has long been regarded with high esteem in naval circles for his application of science to navigation and ship-building. He sailed round the world with Flinders, as astronomer; was wrecked with him; and took part, with the late Sir John Franklin, in that celebrated action in which a fleet of British merchantmen beat off the French Admiral Lincol.

Nov. 28. At Irvington, State of New York, aged 76, the distinguished American novelist and historian, Washington Irving. Washington Irving was the son of a merchant of New York, and was born in that city in 1783. He was intended for the legal profession, and studied for the bar; but a love of literature was even then predominant, and seemed to be engrafted in his nature as its master-passion. Before he was 21 he began his career as a writer. In 1809 he published the amusing "History of New York; by Diedrich Knickerbocker."

DEATHS.

Mr. Irving did not choose the profession of law, but in 1810 went into mercantile business with his brother; but the house failed in 1817. Mr. Irving was at that time resident in Liverpool, manager of the European branch of the firm. This event threw him upon his own resources. He resolved to make a pursuit of literature the object of his life, and, as a result, the "Sketch Book" appeared in 1819. It was recognized as the product of taste and genius; and even English criticism, until then always scornful of American books, paid homage to its merits. Other well-known works followed, as in 1822, "Bracebridge Hall;" in 1824, the "Tales of a Traveller;" in 1828, the "Life of Columbus;" in 1829, the "Conquest of Granada;" and, in 1831, "The Alhambra."

Meantime Mr. Irving, in 1829, 1830, and 1831, had been appointed Secretary to the American Embassy in London; and during his residence abroad he had spent much time in Spain and in various parts of Europe, acquiring the friendship and esteem of the most distinguished men of the day. In 1832 he returned to his native country, after an absence of seventeen years; and his return was a triumph, so heartily was he welcomed home by his fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Irving continued his literary labours, and the result of a visit made to the Indian tribes was, in 1835, the elegant "Tour on the Prairies." Then followed "Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey," "Legends of the Conquest of Spain," in 1836, "Astoria," and in 1837, "The Adventures of Captain Bonneville."

In 1842 Mr. Irving was honoured with the appointment of Minister to Spain, and at the end of his official term in 1846 he returned to the United States. In 1848 he superintended a revised edition of his works, in 1849 published "Oliver Goldsmith," and in 1850 "Mahomet and his Successors," and then "Wolfert's Roost."

Irving's heart for several years had been fixed upon a "Life of Washington," and the completion of a graceful narrative, which will ever be a monument to his industry and patriotism, proved to be the rounding off of a truly glorious career.

Rarely is there a life of so much daily beauty as was that of Washington Irving. While his literary reputation is as imperishable as the language, his worth as a man won him the lasting regards of the wise and the good; and genius and elo-

quence, wherever the sad intelligence of his decease shall be known, will unite to pay just tribute to the memory of a truly illustrious character, who commanded the veneration of his countrymen.

The merits of Washington Irving were freely recognized in this country. Besides the general appreciation of his works by the public at large, he had the honour to receive, along with Henry Hallam, the gold medal of the Royal Society of Literature, as one of the most distinguished of living historical writers; and the University of Oxford bestowed upon him the degree of D.C.L. Washington Irving never married.

Dec. 17. At the Glebe, Kilfane, aged 88, the Ven. Crinus Irwin, Archdeacon of Ossory, Vicar-General of Leighlin, Prebendary of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

Oct. 1. At Birmingham, aged 75, the Rev. John Angell James, Pastor of Carr's-lane Chapel, author of many popular religious works, and one of the most esteemed ministers of the Independent denomination.

Mr. James was born at Blandford, on the 6th of June, 1785, and received an ordinary education, calculated to fit him for the duties of commercial life; but having a strong inclination for the ministry, became a pupil of the College at Gosport. An accidental preaching at the Carr's-lane Chapel, at Birmingham, in 1804, attracted the attention of the congregation, and he became their permanent minister and loved pastor for fifty-five years. The jubilee of his ministry, in 1855, was celebrated by the members of his denomination with great enthusiasm: indeed, such was his repute as a worthy servant of Christ, that the members of most other Dissenting bodies joined; nor were the clergymen of the Church of England to whom he was known wanting in adding their tribute to his worth. A testimonial was presented to Mr. James in the shape of a splendid silver vase, and a purse containing 500*l*. Mr. James's dealing with this sum was characteristic of a disinterested and benevolent mind. He added to it 500*l*. from his own fortune, and founded therewith a fund for the relief of aged and infirm pastors, on condition that a further sum of 4000*l*. was contributed to the same fund—a purpose which was finally accomplished. In permanent commemoration of the jubilee, a new Congregational chapel was founded at Egbaston.

April 15. "Bombay has lost her fore-

DEATHS.

most citizen. Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, bart., died at his house in town, about 2 o'clock in the morning, and his remains were conveyed to the Tower of Silence at Chowpatty, about 9 o'clock the same morning. The funeral procession was most numerously attended, all the leading members of the Parsee community of course being present. The road along which it passed was crowded with spectators, many of whom, doubtless, were sincere mourners for a man whose charities were sown broadcast. During the ceremony business was almost at a stand throughout the town. The dockyard and other factories were closed; so were all the schools and colleges. In the Government offices all the Parsee clerks were allowed leave of absence. Most of the Parsee shops and places of business were shut up, as were those of many sympathizing Hindoos. In the afternoon all the banks were closed by common consent. The man to whom these unusual honours were paid had been a successful man, but it was not his success that won him these honours. He was a wealthy man, but they were not paid to his wealth. Those who rendered them thought not of what he was or what he had, but of what he had done. They were paid to his active and boundless beneficence. Sir Jamsetjee was an able man, so far as a sound and shrewd judgment, indomitable resolution, and untiring perseverance constitute ability; but it was for his liberal spirit and willing hand that he was honoured. The late Baronet was of humble stock, and was altogether a self-made man. His parents, who died while he was a mere child, belonged to Nowsaree, a small town in the Baroda territories, but their son was born at Bombay. The date of his birth was the 15th of July, 1783, so that he was near the ripe age of 76 when he died. He had to make his own way in the world, and by the time he was sixteen he was fully prepared to do so. That way was at first rough and hard, but undiscouraged he went right on. The early life of the wealthy and honoured Baronet was strongly in contrast with the calm which enveloped his later years. He made five mercantile voyages to China. In one of these, the ship in which he sailed formed one of the fleet which, under the command of Sir Nathaniel Dance, beat off a French squadron under Admiral Linois. In another voyage the vessel on board which were himself and his fortune was captured by the French,

and he was carried to the Cape of Good Hope, whence, with the loss of all his property, and after enduring many privations, he found his way, in a Danish vessel, to Calcutta. Fortune smiled on him afterwards, however; and as his wealth increased, we soon find the tendency to share it with the needy, or to spend it for the benefit of the public, begin to develope itself. In 1822 he released all the poor debtors confined by the Court of Requests from the Bombay gaol, by the simple process of paying their debts. From that time to this the stream of his beneficence has scarcely slackened in its flow. The disposal of the vast sums brought to account (above 222,981l.) was not limited by the bounds of the community to which the munificent donor belonged. Parsee and Christian, Hindoo and Mussulman—indeed, people of all classes and creeds—alike shared in his beneficence, the largest outlay being for the poor and for the public. It is for this abounding and indiscriminating beneficence that Sir Jamsetjee was honoured while living, and that his memory will be honoured now that he is dead."—(*From the Bombay Gazette.*) No account is given by the local papers of the charities of this princely merchant, though it will occur to many readers that whenever some plan of large benevolence was afoot, the name of the Parsee was always to be seen set down for a great sum of rupees. It was, it is believed, after the loyalty of the deceased and his sect to the British rule had been evidenced by great contributions to the Patriotic Fund, and the fund for the relief of the Indian sufferers, that, in 1857, the British Government testified its appreciation of his services by the somewhat extraordinary proceeding of conferring on him the dignity of a Baronet.

May 19. Count Jellachich, the celebrated Ban of Croatia, died recently at Agram, in the 59th year of his age. No man has been more highly lauded and more bitterly attacked than the late Ban. By the Imperialists he was regarded as a hero; by the Revolutionists he is held out to be a base fellow, without talent, character, or action, who saved an empire and ruined a great insurrection by a fortunate concurrence of stupidity, meanness, and perfidy. In either view he could have been no common man: and the views of his admirers, reduced to rational dimensions, are probably the most just. According, then, to his ad-

DEATHS.

mirers, the Ban Jellachich had that genius which inspires at once the affection and reverence of men; and, born both a warrior and a poet, he had acquired that great ascendancy over the minds of the wild nation over which he was chief which could alone have enabled him to play the memorable part he did in the days of 1848. Never, perhaps, was so much dependent on the will and energy of one man, as when the Ban saved the Austrian empire at that terrible period. Never could you point so distinctly at the armed hand that had torn a page from the book of history. On that page of 1848 was already written, as it seemed, the doom of the Austrian empire, when a new task was assigned to the historian by means of an exploit which can hardly be matched for daring and brilliancy since the world's chronicle began. It was only the great influence which the Croat chief had acquired over the wild tribes under his command that enabled him to take advantage of the opportunity afforded him. The first week of October, 1848, brought a crisis of fearful importance to Austria. The then Emperor had been compelled to yield point after point to the Vienna revolutionists, until he at length made his escape from the capital and sought refuge at Olmutz. Radetzky and the army of Italy were fully engaged by the revolt of Lombardy; the Bohemians had been recently in a state of insurrection; the whole force of Hungary, the flower of the Austrian empire, was now arrayed in deadly conflict against the heir of Maria Theresa. At that time Jellachich was with difficulty holding his own in Hungary against the swarming levies of the Magyars. But on hearing of the flight of the Emperor from Vienna, he determined to hazard all for the sake of striking a blow at that capital, now the centre of the revolution. Abandoning his operations in Hungary, he hurried by forced marches towards Vienna. A more perilous die was never thrown than that set upon the movement in question. Jellachich and his Croats were now the only force which could take an active part on behalf of the House of Hapsburg. But that part was taken against fearful odds. Before him the ramparts of Vienna were held by the revolutionary levies; close behind him the Hungarian army pressed in pursuit. It is remarkable that at this moment of danger the principle of nationality which M. Kossuth so eloquently invokes, and to which the ex-

istence of Austria is supposed to be antagonistic, was the very principle asserted for the purpose of saving the empire. Not even the blunders of the Hungarian General Moza, nor the pusillanimity of Kossuth, who was among the first to take to flight on the battle-field of Schwechat, contributed so much to the triumphant success of the Ban as the address of the latter to the Slavonians of Bohemia, in which he called on them for assistance on the ground of their community of race with the Croats and Transylvanians. Up to this time the Bohemians had been making common cause with the revolution; they now responded to the cry of nationality, and at once joined heart and soul with their Croat brethren. This change set the troops of Windischgrätz free to join those of Jellachich; and the result was the salvation of the Austrian empire.

Dec. 9. At Creswell Hall, suddenly, aged 31, Alice Henrietta, wife of J. H. Jenkinson, esq., and third dau. of the late Sir W. G. Cumming, bart., of Altyre, Morayshire.

Feb. 6. Aged 41, Mr. William Freeling Jerdan, second son of Mr. William Jerdan, editor of the *Literary Gazette*.

Aug. 10. At Versailles, the Hon. Mrs. Edward Stafford, widow of the Hon. E. Stafford Jerningham.

May 6. At her residence, Fairfield-villa, near Broadstairs, Kent, aged 55, Mrs. Jerrold, widow of Douglas Jerrold.

Oct. 3. At the family residence in Berkeley-sq., aged 86, George Child Villiers, K.G.H., fifth Earl of Jersey, Viscount Villiers of Dartford, and Baron Villiers of Hoo, county of Kent, in the peerage of England, and Viscount Grandison of Limerick, county of Leitrim, in the peerage of Ireland. The deceased was the eldest of the two sons of George Bussey, fourth Earl, by his marriage with Frances, daughter and heir of the Right Rev. Philip Twisden, Bishop of Raphoe. He married, on the 23rd of May, 1804, Lady Sarah Sophia Fane, eldest daughter of the late Earl of Westmoreland, by Sarah Anne, only daughter and heiress of Mr. Robert Child, the wealthy banker of Fleet Street, and has left issue. The deceased peer succeeded to the family honours and estates on the death of his father in August, 1803. For a few months in 1830 he held the office of Lord Chamberlain of the King's Household. On the late Earl Grey succeeding the Duke of Wellington as First Lord of

DEATHS.

the Treasury, he retired; but on Sir Robert Peel's accession to office, in 1834, his Lordship was again appointed Lord Chamberlain. In 1841 the noble Earl succeeded the late Earl of Albemarle as Master of the Horse to the Queen, which office of state he held until the break-up of Sir Robert Peel's second administration. Although a thorough Conservative in politics, he supported the Government of Sir Robert Peel in the repeal of the corn laws, and all the commercial measures of Reform introduced by that statesman. When the Earl of Derby came into power, in 1852, the Earl of Jersey was selected to fill the post of Master of the Horse—an office which it is said he was requested by the Earl of Aberdeen to retain. Since that period the Earl of Jersey, from weight of years and increasing infirmities, retired into private life.

Oct. 24. The grave had barely closed over the venerable head of the House of Jersey before his successor was also taken away. The sixth Earl of Jersey, who succeeded to the earldom on the death of his father on the 3rd Oct., died at Brighton on the 24th. The deceased nobleman had for months past been in declining health, and early in the last spring repaired to the south of France; but his lordship only received temporary relief. The deceased was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. Shortly after he attained his majority he entered the House of Commons for the borough of Rochester, and in 1831 was elected for Minehead. From 1832 to 1835 he sat for Honiton. At the next general election he unsuccessfully contested Weymouth; he was returned for that borough in 1841, but was unseated on petition. In 1844 he was elected Member for Cirencester, which borough he continued to represent up to 1852. On the general election in that year he was defeated by the Hon. A. G. J. Ponsonby by the narrow majority of four. In politics the late Peer was a Conservative; and during the late Sir R. Peel's administration of public affairs he voted in favour of the repeal of the corn laws and the subsequent free-trade measures of that eminent statesman. The deceased Earl married, in 1841, Julia, eldest daughter of the late Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, by whom he leaves issue. The late Earl was a Deputy-Lieutenant of the counties of Oxford and Warwick, and in 1855 was appointed Major of the Oxfordshire Yeomanry Cav.

Feb. 28. At his residence, the Ob-

servatory, Oxford, aged 54, Manuel John Johnson, esq., M.A., Radcliffe Observer, one of the most eminent astronomers of the day.

Mr. Johnson was educated at Addiscombe, and in 1821 entered the Artillery. The leisure of a ten years' military residence at St. Helena was relieved by the amusement of observing the stars. The result of this discovered taste was the erection of the St. Helena Observatory, which was completed in 1829, after four years of preparation, in course of which Mr. Johnson twice visited the Observatory at the Cape, then under the direction of Mr. Fallows. Working here with meridian instruments—for he had no equatorially mounted telescope—he devoted his whole attention to the Southern Hemisphere, and the result of his labours, which appeared in 1835 in the shape of a "Catalogue of 606 Principal Fixed Stars of the Southern Hemisphere," attests his fidelity and industry as director of the Observatory of which he was the founder. This important catalogue is, except the Madras catalogues, the only source for exact places of the fixed stars situated beyond the reach of the observatories of Europe.

Upon the disbanding of the Artillery corps in St. Helena Mr. Johnson returned to England, and, after some months of European travelling, entered at Magdalene Hall, Oxford, where he went through the academical course. He had no sooner taken his degree than the Radcliffe Observatory became vacant by the death of Mr. Rigaud, and he received the appointment from the trustees. He now recommenced in earnest his astronomical labours, and selected as the region of his observations the circumpolar heavens. Taking the Groombridge Catalogue as his foundation, he re-observed all the stars, more than 4000, included in that catalogue, and added 1500 other stars not found in Groombridge. The meridian instruments of the Radcliffe Observatory were for several years almost wholly employed for this work, and volumes 40—53 of the Radcliffe Observatory are filled with observations and special catalogues, all designed for ultimate collection into one large catalogue of circumpolar stars.

In 1849 the magnificent heliometer was mounted; a splendid instrument, the work of Repsold, of Hamburg. The observations with this instrument began very soon after its erection. They in-

DEATHS.

clude a great number of double stars and other objects for which this instrument is particularly appropriate. The object of these observations was to determine the parallaxes of several fixed stars. In 1853 the first series of heliometer observations was published, together with an investigation of the parallaxes of 61 Cygni, and of the star 1880 Groombridge. Another series came out in 1857, together with an investigation of the parallaxes of Castor (*a* Geminorum), Arcturus (*a* Bootis), Veza (*a* Lyre), and of two other stars called in the volume *a* and *b*, which were of importance as means of establishing the parallax of 1830 Groombridge.

Besides the exhausting labours of astronomical science, Mr. Johnson instituted a series of meteorological observations, of great care and importance. These severe pursuits were relieved by a great love of art, in which his judgment was conspicuous, and by the society and love of a large circle of friends suited to appreciate Mr. Johnson's learning and knowledge of the world and lively conversation.

April 15. At Alresford, Hants, of jaundice, aged 39, the Rev. Vanden Bempdè Johnstone, M.A., Curate of Itchin-Stoke, fifth son of Charles Phillips Johnstone, esq., of Newbold-manor, Staffordshire.

July 21. At the Hangingshaw, Selkirk, N.B., the Hon. Mrs. Johnstone, of Alva. Mrs. Johnstone was the dau. of the late Lord Grantley.

Dec. 1. At Cranmer Hall, Norfolk, the Dowager Lady Jones, widow of Maj.-General Sir John Thomas Jones, bart., K.C.B., of the Royal Engineers.

June 22. In Sloane-st., aged 52, the Hon. Mrs. Keane, dau. of the late Lord Keane.

Aug. 7. In Bryanston-sq., aged 88, the Hon. John Kennedy, second son of the eleventh Earl of Cassilis.

Sept. 25. At Benares, E.I., after sixty years of continuous residence in the country, aged 81, Lieut.-General James Kennedy, C.B., of the Bengal Light Cavalry.

May 15. At Notting-hill, aged 60, James Kennedy, esq., barrister-at-law, formerly M.P. for Tiverton, and late H.M.'s Judge in the Mixed Court of Justice at Havana.

June 5. At Bishopstoke, Hants, the Hon. Lady Keppel, wife of Rear-Admiral Sir Henry Keppel, K.C.B.

May 28. At Streatham, Surrey, Louisa, wife of Sir Kingsmill G. Key, bart.

Jan. 2. At the Castle-yard, Windsor, aged 69, Sally, wife of Capt. John Duncan King, Military Knight of Windsor, and sister to the late Lord Chief Justice Tindal.

May 26. At his residence, Newbridge House, near Bath, aged 80, Lieut.-Col. T. Kirkwood, formerly commanding Her Majesty's Sixty-fourth Regt., and late of Castlewood, co. Sligo, Ireland.

June 24. At St. James's Palace, after a few days' illness, Baron Knessebeck, Equerry to His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, which post he also occupied in the household of the late Duke.

July 27. At Frankfort-on-the-Maine, aged 82, Christian Koch, late H.M.'s respected Consul in that city.

Mr. Koch was a naturalized Englishman, and his talents were of a high order. He was profoundly versed in European politics, and enjoyed the personal friendship of the late Sir Robert Peel and many other leading statesmen, who entertained high respect for his diplomatic knowledge and experience. He was also honoured by marks of esteem from George IV. and his successor. His services to the British Government, though unostentatious, were most valuable. He was an ardent advocate of free trade, and rendered material assistance to the Government of Sir Robert Peel when that statesman brought forward his free-trade measures. His courtesy and hospitality to English travellers of every class were justly celebrated and recorded in every book of travel, while valuable advice and pecuniary assistance were rarely or never wanting to those in temporary difficulties or distress. Mr. Koch had long retired from the consulate, which was conferred upon his son, and died at a great age, regretted by a host of friends, and leaving in his public capacity an almost European reputation.

March 23. In Paris, Count Sigismund Krasinski, a Polish noble, hero, and poet. He was related to the royal houses of Saxony and Piedmont, and his godfather was the Emperor Napoleon, who appointed him on the day of his birth aide-de-camp to the King of Rome. His family was one of the noblest in Poland. The Confederation of Bar, the last of national Polish Governments, at a time when Poland was battling with its three invaders, was presided over by two Krasinskis; one of them a marshal, the other

DEATHS.

Bishop of Kamieniec. General Count Krasinski, the father of Sigismund, was commandant of the Light Cavalry under Napoleon. It was he who, after the death of Poniatowski, brought back to his country the heroic remains of the Polish Legions. Count Sigismund's was an agitated and sorrowful existence. A great nobleman, a great poet, and one of the richest men in Europe, he might have aimed at the highest destinies, yet he voluntarily resigned himself to an obscure and passive life. The most brilliant offers were made to him from the highest quarters. Once the Emperor Nicholas desired to see him. "Be with me," said the Czar, "and I will grant you anything you may ask." But Count Sigismund could not bear to witness the subjection of his country. He went abroad, and sent forth from the depths of his voluntary exile snatches of verse, which he never acknowledged. The Poles sang these inspired hymns without knowing their author.

Sept. 24. At his residence, Chester-terr., Belgravia, aged 54, Chevalier Krehmer, the Russian Consul-General in this country.

Dec. 1. At the Clarendon Hotel, Bond-st., London, of small-pox, His Excellency Major-Gen. Don Neri, one of the princes of the House of Corsini and Marquis of Lajatico, who had for some time discharged the duties of Special Envoy from the present Government of Tuscany. The Marquis was held in the very highest esteem by men of all parties, not merely in London and Paris, but in his own country. His high birth, great talents, and high character, had made him a leader of the liberal party in Tuscany without depriving him of the respect of its opponents.

July 29. At his residence, in Brook-st., Ipswich, aged 79, Samuel Lane, esq., an eminent artist, formerly of Greek-st., Soho, London.

Mr. Lane was born at Lynn, in Norfolk. By an accident in early life, he became totally deaf, and incapable of articulating distinctly. In these unfortunate circumstances, his parents designed him for the profession of an artist, and he was placed under Mr. Farrington, R.A., and afterwards of Sir Thomas Lawrence. His aptitude for his profession was such that he became the favourite pupil of his great master, who, feeling that his deprivations were a bar to public success, offered him constant employment in his own studio,

undertaking to make a permanent provision for him. This liberal proposition Mr. Lane manfully rejected, and his independent spirit was rewarded by fair success. For many years Mr. Lane's works were among the most valued of those hung on the walls of the Royal Academy. Among the great men whom Lane delineated was Nelson, whom he had known in his youth, the Marquis Cornwallis, Major-Gen. Sir Geo. Pollock, Lord Lynedoch (General Graham), the late Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield), Dr. Kaye, late Bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Murray, Bishop of Rochester; Sir Philip Broke, bart., the present Duke of Richmond, the late Earl of Devon, Lord George Bentinck, M.P., Mr. Coke, M.P., afterwards Lord Leicester, and Sir Wm. Grant, formerly Master of the Rolls. Mr. Lane was a descendant of the loyal Lanes who assisted the escape of Charles the Second after the battle of Worcester.

April 29. At Paris, aged 66, Dr. Dionysius Lardner, a man of science, and editor of the serial work entitled *Lardner's Cyclopædia*.

Dr. Lardner was the son of a Dublin solicitor. After receiving such education as was to be had in Irish schools at the beginning of the present century, he was placed in his father's office. Evincing, however, a very decided distaste for the legal profession, he was entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, and devoted himself to scientific studies. He soon showed that he had now chosen the right path in life, and he rapidly gained an extraordinary number of prizes in pure mathematics, as well as in natural philosophy, astronomy, and other branches of study. In 1817 he obtained a B.A. degree, and for ten years remained at the University, publishing at first various treatises on mathematics, including the differential and integral calculus, and subsequently on the steam-engine. For this he obtained a gold medal from the Royal Dublin Society; and his reputation being now in a great measure established, he began to contribute to the *Edinburgh Encyclopædia* and the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, writing elaborate articles on pure mathematics, as well as on the applied sciences. In 1827, on the establishment of the London University, Dr. Lardner accepted the chair of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, and, removing to London, he set on foot a scheme for a *Cabinet Encyclopædia*, which he gradually perfected, obtaining the co-operation of many

DEATHS.

men eminent in different branches of science. The progress of Dr. Lardner to fame and fortune received a severe check by a terrible scandal. In 1840 the philosopher eloped with the wife of Mr. Heavyside, a lady of mature years. The result was an action of *crim. con.*, in which Dr. Lardner was amerced in damages to the amount of £8000. He withdrew, in consequence, to the United States. When, at length, he returned to England, he devoted his studies to "Railway Economy," and writing a good deal on this and other subjects, Dr. Lardner started his last important work, the *Museum of Science and Art*, which contains many of the best popular treatises on science which have ever been written. Few, if any, scientific men have done more than Dr. Lardner towards extending scientific knowledge among the people, and none were more eminently qualified for the work. Not only were his acquirements as profound as those of any man of his day, but he possessed in a peculiarly high degree that happy facility of throwing into popular and graphic language the most elaborate theories of science, and leading minds unaccustomed to scientific reasoning to an appreciation of scientific truths, which would have been altogether incomprehensible if involved in the obscurity of technical phraseology.

Dec. 10. A person named Roger Larois has just died at Paris at the age of 100 precisely, day for day, and even hour for hour. It was at 1 o'clock in the afternoon of the 10th of December, 1759, that he was born, and at 1 o'clock in the afternoon of the 10th of December, 1859, that he died. He was a very remarkable personage, having excelled as painter, engraver, poet, and musician; and yet he was totally unknown to the public, because he would never consent to exhibit or publish any of his productions. His father was a hosier of the Rue Saint Denis. He displayed so much talent that his father, who had a fortune of 30,000 francs a year to leave, resolved to let him follow his bent. He even allowed the boy's godfather, an Englishman, to take him to London for instruction, and there the godfather procured him lessons from Flaxman and Fuseli. Old Larois having died, Roger came to Paris, and, having received his father's property, resolved to devote himself exclusively to poetry and art. And, as the taste of the day in both appeared to him to be vicious, he

determined to follow out his own ideal; and in order to do so completely, without being influenced either by the criticisms of contemporaries or the caprices of fashion, he further determined to keep his works to himself. He caused a house to be built on his plans in the Boulevard de Mont Parnasse, and annexed to it a vast painting-room and two picture-galleries. There he laboured incessantly year after year in painting and engraving, in composing poetry and in setting it to music. He carefully preserved all that he produced, and all his productions are collected in the two galleries—his poetry, music, and engravings in shelves along the wall, and his paintings ranged according to date. These paintings show that, although at first he was a brilliant colourist, he was but an indifferent designer, and that afterwards he laboured to unite the two qualities,—design and colour. Most of the subjects of his paintings are allegorical; but he was also an excellent portrait painter, and he has left not fewer than forty-nine portraits of his wife, whom he tenderly loved—his rule being to make one on each anniversary of her birthday.

Lately. At the Bridge of Allan, Professor Lawrie, M.D., Professor of Surgery in the University of Glasgow.

March 3. At his residence, Marchfield House, Berks, aged 63, Rear-Adm. J. M. Laws.

Aug. 18. Captain Lawson, of the 42nd Highlanders, from a wound on the knee received during the suppression of the mutiny. The career of this gallant soldier is worthy of note. Captain Lawson, who was a native of Lanark, entered the army in 1837, having before that time been employed as a ploughboy. He served worthily as a non-commissioned officer for nearly sixteen years. In 1854 he embarked with the regiment for the Crimea, was present at the Alma, and passed unscathed through all the hardships and perils of that memorable campaign. After Inkermann, along with a number of deserving non-commissioned officers serving in other regiments, he received his commission as ensign. In March, 1855, he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant, and for some time previous to the conclusion of the war acted as captain in the late Land Transport Corps. On his return to England, in 1856, he rejoined the 42nd, and shortly after received the appointment of in-

DEATHS.

structor of musketry to the regiment. At this time also the magistrates and council of Lanark (his native town), in consideration of his distinguished conduct, agreed to present him with the freedom of that ancient burgh; this honour, however, the gallant gentleman never had an opportunity of personally receiving. The outbreak of the Indian mutiny called him again to the field, and in August, 1857, he left England with the headquarters of the regiment for Calcutta. In 1858 he obtained his commission as captain, and shortly after received the wound which, on the 18th of August last, ended his honourable career. Captain Lawson commanded the picket of the 42nd, thirty-seven in number, which was engaged in the terrible fight on the banks of the Suarda, on the morning of the 15th of January, with upwards of 2000 rebels. The little band of Highlanders defended themselves with extraordinary courage from sunrise to sunset, until relief arrived from General Walpole. Captain Lawson was honourably mentioned in the General's despatches for the manner in which he acquitted himself on that day.

May 2. At his residence in the College, aged 79, the Very Rev. John Lee, D.D., Principal of the University of Edinburgh.

Dr. Lee was born about 1780, in a village on the Gala Water. He was for a time under the celebrated Dr. Leyden, and afterwards passed to the University of Edinburgh, where he took a degree in medicine. Subsequently, however, he entered the Church, his first charge being a Scotch church in London. His next preferment was to Peebles, where he resided for four years; and, thus early rising to some degree of eminence, he was in 1812 elected to the chair of Church History in the University of St. Andrews. Dr. Lee, besides other appointments, afterwards successively filled the charges of the Canongate, Lady Yester's, and the Old Church in Edinburgh, until, in 1840, he was elected by the Town Council to the high office of Principal of the University. He took part in at least one Government commission, and also held the position of Secretary to the Bible Board. He did not shrink from taking a share of the ecclesiastical controversy of the times, ever showing, however, a manly and temperate bearing. In 1844 he was elected to the chair of Divinity in the University,

which he held in conjunction with the Principalship. On his appointment to the latter, he resigned his charge as one of the ministers of the city, and devoted himself earnestly to the duties of his new office. In the same year he was elected to the Moderator's chair; and many of the pastoral letters that from time to time were addressed to the Church were from his pen.

Principal Lee was one of the Deans of the Chapel Royal, and a Fellow of the Royal Society.

Dec. 17. In Waterloo-st., Stoke, aged 90, Mr. John Lee, superannuated rigger in H.M.'s Dockyard, Devonport. He served with Lord Howe on the 1st of June, 1794, and also with Lord Nelson at the battle of the Nile, 1798.

Dec. 26. At Gravesend, aged 79, J. Lee, esq., enamel painter to the Royal Family from George III. to the present reign.

May 4. At the Clarendon Hotel, London, of diphtheria, aged 60, Francis Godolphin D'Arcy D'Arcy Osborne, Duke of Leeds, county of York; Marquis of Carmarthen, county of Carmarthen; Earl of Danby, county of York; Viscount Latimer of Danby; Baron Conyers of Hornby Castle; and Osborne of Kiverton, county of York, in the peerage of England; Viscount Osborne of Dunblane, county of Perth, in the peerage of Scotland, and a baronet of England. His Grace was the eldest and only surviving son of George William Frederick, sixth Duke, by his marriage with Lady Charlotte Townshend, sixth daughter of George, first Marquis Townshend. He was born on the 21st of May, 1798, and married, on the 24th of April, 1828, Louisa Catherine, third daughter of Mr. Richard Caton, of Maryland, America, and sister of the late Marchioness Wellesley and of the Dowager Lady Stafford, who was widow of Sir Felton E. Bathurst Hervey.

His grace was summoned to the House of Lords during his father's lifetime by the family barony of Osborne, of Kiverton, but succeeded to the ducal honours within a month—namely, in July, 1838. In early life he served a short time in the army. In 1846 he was appointed Colonel-in-Chief of the North York Militia (Rifles). In politics he was a Whig, but he took no very active part in political affairs. His grace moved the Address at the opening of the session of 1854. In default of issue the dukedom and other

DEATHS.

dignities devolve upon his cousin, Lord Godolphin, eldest son of the first peer of that title, who was elder brother of the late Duke's father.

Jan. 25. At Cambridge-terr., Hyde-park, aged 37, Emily, wife of Colonel Lefroy, R.A., eldest daughter of Sir John Beverley Robinson, bart., C.B., Chief Justice of Upper Canada.

June 3. At Banda, in Central India, aged 36, Lieut.-Col. Edmund Cornwall Legh, C.B., officer of the Legion of Honour, commanding H.M.'s 97th Regt.

This gallant officer was the fourth son of the late George John Legh, esq., of High Legh, and brother of Mr. Cornwall Legh, M.P. for South Cheshire. He won his first commission at the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst. He served with his regiment on various stations, and on the outbreak of the war with Russia was sent to the Crimea, and served throughout that terrible campaign in the most distinguished manner. During a part of that time he was aide-de-camp to Maj.-Gen. Lockyer. Lieut.-Col. Legh's active services in the field were—first, at the siege of Sebastopol, from November 20, 1854, until its fall, and subsequently until the evacuation of the Crimea, in June, 1856. At the attack on the Great Redan, September 8, 1855, he was second in command of the ladder party. After securely planting his ladders, he fought his way, ably assisted by his gallant comrades, until he found himself left with but four other officers and three privates of different regiments, in the salient angle of the Redan. Out of thirteen officers, and 360 rank and file of his own regiment, who went into action with him on that day, 201 rank and file were killed and wounded, five officers were also killed, and six wounded, he and one other officer only escaping untouched. On this occasion he brought his regiment out of action, and was mentioned in the highest terms in the despatches of the Commander-in-Chief and of Lieut.-Gen. Sir William Codrington. He was promoted to Lieut.-Col. in the army for his "distinguished conduct in the field" on this occasion. He received the cross of the French *Légion d'Honneur*, the Crimean war medal and clasp, and the Turkish Medjidje medal. Secondly, in the suppression of the mutiny in India from 1857 to 1859. By this time he had converted his brevet into substantive rank, and was on the same day appointed to the second lieutenant-colonelcy of his old regiment, the

97th. In 1857 he joined the Jaunpore field force, under Maj.-Gen. Sir T. H. Franks, K.C.B., and commanded the regiment in the action and capture of the fort Musrulpore, January 26, 1858. He was mentioned in General Franks' despatches as "having acquitted himself entirely to his satisfaction." Also, in the actions of Cheuda and Amereepore, on the 19th of February, 1858; the battle of Sultanpore, February 23, 1858; and the action of Fort Dhowrara, March 4, 1858, on the night of which day he joined the main army under Lord Clyde, forming part of the 4th division during the siege, and at the final capture of Lucknow led his gallant regiment to the assault and capture of the Kaiserbagh. On this occasion he again brought his regiment out of action, and succeeded to the command; thus obtaining the highest place in the corps which he had entered an ensign, and with which he had struggled in many a well-fought field. Having been twice mentioned in the despatches with the highest praise, Her Majesty conferred upon him the Companionship of the Bath; and he received the Indian war medal and clasp. Lieut.-Col. Legh had escaped the chances of war to fall beneath the influence of the climate. While engaged in the active duties of his command, he was struck down by apoplexy, and died in a few hours; having performed many brave deeds, and won his way to the command of his regiment before he had completed his 35th year.

Feb. 15. At Carton, Dublin, the Duchess of Leinster. Her grace was the youngest daughter of Charles, third Earl of Harrington.

Feb. 19. At Freefield, Aberdeenshire, aged 84, General Sir Alexander Leith, K.C.B., of Glenkindie and Freefield, a distinguished veteran of the Peninsular war.

May 5. At his house in St. John's-wood, aged 65, Charles Robert Leslie, an eminent artist.

Mr. Leslie was born in London in the year 1794, of American parents. He was educated at Philadelphia, U.S., and was apprenticed to his brother, a bookseller; but must have given early indications of a love for art, since, in 1811, he returned to England, through a wealthy patron, for the express purpose of studying painting.

He began life in the humble Buckingham-street, Fitzroy-square, in the very cross-trees of the house,—in fact, the usual garret of needy genius. West and Washington Allston, both Americans like

G G

himself, were his earliest instructors. In 1821 he was elected Associate of the Academy, and in 1826 full R.A. The events of his life are few; in 1833 he was appointed by the American Government Professor of Drawing to the Military Academy at West Point, a post which required not genius, but mere rule and line exactitude. He went out, got sick of the dull toil in five months, resigned, and returned finally to England. He ranks with West, Newton, and Allston, as one of the four American painters who have earned an English fame. Leslie has been unjustly called a painter's painter. The grace, loveliness, gentleness, and purity of his creations can be appreciated by all. He has interpreted for all of us—beautified and illumined for all of us—some of the choicest passages of Shakespeare, Don Quixote, Sterne, Smollett, Fielding, Milton, Scott, and Molière. He painted religious pictures and court pictures; wrote nearly the best artist's biography; lectured successfully on painting, and wrote a delightful book on art. His lectures at the Royal Academy were published in *The Athenæum* at the time of their delivery, and we can answer for it that their interest is very far from gone by. His range was wide, and his facility great, as his long connection with the Sketching Club satisfactorily proves. For forty years he sustained in art, with rarely-failing power, his simple, unpretending manner, full of quiet certainty and power, latterly only somewhat wavering and enfeebled. In the Sheepshanks collection the nation, luckily, may see him at his zenith; his colour cold, heavy sometimes in its greens and purples and dull reds, but still never forgetful of the purity of the tones in the silver spoon. His humour has an exquisite "bouquet" about it; his conception of female beauty was pure, and of the first order; his imagination was powerful, but is hidden by its very simplicity, perfect propriety, and truth. He tells a story perfectly, dramatically, simply, and always without affectation, choosing the exact moment of the climax. He seldom attempted textural imitation, but he knew exactly what a brushful of paint could stand for. His touch was elastically light—accurate, yet firm. Thank goodness, Mr. Leslie soon left "Saul and the Witch of Endor" for "Belinda and Tom Jones." Perhaps there never was so exquisitely simple a painter of sheer ideal scenes. He paints them, too, not as if they had flashed hastily

across his vision, but as if he had lived for years with every character. His Don Quixote, Petruccio, Sterne, Dominic Sampson, Perdita, are just perfect. His early pictures, "Sir Roger de Coverley," "Anne Page and Slender," and "May Day in the reign of Elizabeth," are the most laboured; latterly his colour grew lurid and his simplicity somewhat scattered and flimsy. In the Vernon Gallery is to be found one at least of Leslie's masterpieces, "Sancho and the Duchess." In private life the painter was one of the gentlest and most amiable of men, ever cheerful, ever ready to oblige, and most earnest in his desire to foster and instruct rising talent. Mr. Leslie was also a very able writer, having published an excellent biography of Constable, and the Lectures he delivered at the Royal Academy, as Professor of Painting, under the title of "Handbook for Young Painters," and had nearly completed "A Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds."

March 28. At Inverleith-terrace, Edinburgh, the Hon. Mrs. Geo. Melville Leslie.

Oct. 24. At Brighton, at a very advanced age, Lieut.-General Griffith George Lewis, C.B., Colonel Commandant Royal Engineers. This distinguished veteran entered the service upwards of half a century ago, as second lieutenant of the above scientific corps, and served the campaign in Naples and Calabria in 1805 and 1806, including the battle of Maida and siege of Scylla castle, capture of Ischia and Procida in the Bay of Naples in August, 1809, and siege of the castle of the former place. He was also engaged at the siege of the fort at Santa Maura in 1810, served the campaign of 1813 in the Peninsula, and lost his leg above the knee at the assault of the breach of San Sebastian. He had received the war medal and two clasps, and was also in receipt of the pension for distinguished and meritorious services.

May 26. At Barbados, aged 23, Sophia Delafosse, elder surviving daughter of the Ven. C. Lawson, Archdeacon of Barbados.

May 2. On board the "Louisiana," on his passage from Rangoon, aged 37, Capt. Herbert Lloyd, Twenty-first N.I., youngest son of John William Lloyd, esq., Dan-yr-Alt, Llangadock, Carmarthenshire.

Oct. 2. At her residence in Eaton-sq., aged 81, the Dowager Countess of Lis-towel.

Jan. 20. At Broughton-place, Edinburgh, Sir Alexander Livingstone, bart., of Bedlornie.

DEATHS.

March 11. Mary Keith, wife of Morgan Lloyd, esq., and daughter of the late Admiral the Hon. Charles Elphinstone Fleeming.

Jan. 4. At his house, Earl's-terrace, Kensington, and of Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, aged 52, John Thomas Longman, esq.

May 15. In Upper Grosvenor-street, aged 88, Mrs. Labouchere, mother of the Right Hon. Henry Labouchere, M.P.

May 20. At Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, aged 72, Vice-Admiral W. Stanhope Lovell, K.H., second son of the late Thomas Stanhope Badcock, esq., of Little Missenden Abbey, Bucks.

Sept. 11. At her residence in Green-street, Grosvenor-square, the Hon. Lady Lumley, widow of General the Hon. Sir Wm. Lumley, G.C.B.

May 29. In Dorset-square, aged 79, Gen. Sir James Law Lushington, G.C.B. The deceased general was the son of the Rev. James Stephen Lushington, Vicar of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and prebendary of Carlisle Cathedral, and brother to the Right Hon. Stephen Rumbold Lushington, formerly Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, and subsequently Governor of Madras. He attained the rank of General in the East India Company's Service in 1854. He was elected a Director of the East India Company in 1857, and was Deputy-Chairman in 1836-7, and Chairman in 1838-9. He represented Petersfield, Hastings, and Carlisle at various times in the House of Commons.

June 15. At Bruges, aged 69, Patrick Lynch, esq., late of Tara Hall, co. Meath, and of Ratharmon, co. Sligo.

Sept. 3. Louis Stephens Lyne, esq., Accountant and Comptroller-General of Inland Revenue.

March 19. At Twickenham, aged 76, Arthur Lysaght, Admiral of the Red.

June 10. At Edinburgh, Major-General David Macadam, R.M.

The gallant officer had been 54 years in the Royal Marines, and had greatly distinguished himself in his professional career. While serving in *L'Aigle*, between August, 1805, and May, 1809, he was at the attack on the French fleet by Admiral Cornwallis, on the 21st of Aug., 1805; gunboats in Vigo Bay, 29th of October following; the blockade of Fort Cygo, July and August, 1807; action with French frigate off L'Orient, 22nd of March, 1808; Basque Roads, 11th and 12th of April, 1809; and various other

affairs in the ship or her boats, and was forty times under fire. In the *Thames* frigate, between the 7th of October, 1809, and the 27th of August, 1812, he landed at Mount Circile, Amanthea, Citraco, in the Gulf of Policastro, and several other places on the coast of Calabria and in the Roman States. On board the *Forth*, from the 31st July, 1813, to 29th of September, 1815, he was most actively employed, and was on the staff of the Anglo-Russian force forming the siege of Batlitz. The gallant General subsequently served on the North American coast. He had been not less than seventy times under fire.

June 5. Judge Macan, one of the Judges of the Dublin Court of Bankruptcy. His honour was found dead in his bed, having died of disease of the heart.

Dec. 2. At Tunbridge Wells, Anne, widow of Maj.-Gen. Sir J. M'Caskill, K.C.B.

Dec. 28. At Kensington, in his 60th year, the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Lord Macaulay.

No death which we could chronicle, says *The Times*, from whose admirable biography this memoir is slightly abridged, will be more deeply or more widely lamented than that of Lord Macaulay. His loss is not simply that of a great man. It is the loss of a great man who accumulated immense stores of information that perish with him. As on the funeral pile of some Oriental potentate the wealth of a province is heaped up to be burned, we see passing with the historian into the darkness of the grave not only a majestic mind which sooner or later must have gone from among us, but also the vast acquisitions of this mind, which we fancy might have remained to us for ever. Macaulay's wealth of information was almost incredible, and in all his writings, in his speeches, in his conversations, he poured it forth so lavishly, and yet so carefully, that reader and hearer scarcely knew which to admire most—the extent of his knowledge, or the felicity with which he brought it to bear upon the matter in hand. He had a more intimate acquaintance with English history than any man living, or perhaps any man who ever lived. His acquaintance with it was not a barren knowledge, but had fructified into political wisdom; and no pen could surpass his in the description of what he knew and thought and felt. The death of such a man is more than a common loss—is more than the loss of a man

DEATHS.

equally great in other departments of literature. The material which he handles gives to the work of the historian a value which the work of no other artist enjoys. A great novelist or a great poet may be compared to a worker in colours, which have no value except in the arrangement given to them by the artist. A great historian, on the other hand, is a worker in gold and silver and precious stones, which have a value independent of the workmanship bestowed on them. It requires a great mind to elicit the facts, but the facts have a value in themselves, and if they are not transmitted by the historian who is in possession of them the loss which we sustain is not comparable to that of an additional poem or a new novel from the poet or novelist too soon struck down. Macaulay is cut off in his 60th year, and in the midst of his work. Who is to finish what he has begun? Who is to make good wherein he has failed? The deep regret for such a loss, which will be universally felt wherever the English language is spoken, will be mingled with surprise at its suddenness. Only on Monday last Lord Macaulay had entertained his family at a Christmas party. It is true that for some years he had suffered from an affection of the heart, and three weeks ago he had a return of threatening symptoms. But he appeared to rally again; the symptoms, although serious, were not alarming; and at the Christmas party on Monday last he was only so far unlike himself as to be rather silent. If Sidney Smith had been there, he would not have had to complain, as he once did, that he longed for some "brilliant flashes of silence;" and yet, in spite of Lord Macaulay's quietness, his friends in parting with him that night little thought that in less than forty-eight hours he would be no more for this world. On Wednesday evening, about eight o'clock, he died in a fainting fit, without the least pain.

Thomas Babington Macaulay was born on the 25th of October, 1800, at Rothley Temple, in Leicestershire. He was the son of Zachary Macaulay, who has a monument in Westminster Abbey, and who was well known as a prominent member of the so-called "Clapham Sect," as well as of the philanthropists who exerted themselves for the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery. The family belonged to the Highlands of Scotland, where Zachary Macaulay's father and

uncle were ministers of the Kirk. Dr. Johnson, in his "Tour to the Hebrides," mentions both the Rev. John and the Rev. Kenneth Macaulay in a kindly way, and the Presbyterian origin of the family is worth noticing, as its effects may be traced quite distinctly in the writings of the historian. Especially in his essays—that is to say, his earlier writings—there must be observed a curious familiarity, not simply with scriptural phraseology, which might have been derived from any religious education, but with the pet phrases and formulas which are current among the Presbyterian and metaphysical divines. Although Macaulay could scarcely be called a Scotchman, his religious allusions are as distinctively Scotch as those of Sir Walter Scott himself. His father, Zachary, seems to have been a sturdy Calvinist. He was a West India merchant, who had early in life been sent to Jamaica, and who was so horrified with what he saw there of slavery that he for some years pitched his tent amid all the unhealthiness of Sierra Leone, with the hope of doing good to the negroes. It was under the influence of such a character and of his associates, who at that time were held up to public scorn as the "Clapham Sect," that Lord Macaulay was brought up. His education began at home; he was then placed under the care of a Mr. Preston, at Shelford in Cambridgeshire; and finally he entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1818. His career at the University was very distinguished. In his first year he gained the Chancellor's medal for a poem on "Pompeii;" in his second year he carried off the same prize for a poem on "Evening," both of which have been published; immediately afterwards he gained the second Craven Scholarship; in 1822 he took his Bachelor's degree, and though he did not compete for honours, owing to his dislike of mathematics, he was elected a Fellow of his college. Macaulay, moreover, made a great figure in the Union Debating Society, where he spent a good deal of his time. He was to study for the bar, and it was evident that he was to be an orator. What were his chances of promotion? He had a Fellowship to begin with; he had a father who was not only in good circumstances, but was also a leading member of a fraternity that had some political influence, and has always been celebrated for the virtue which phrenologists have termed "adhesiveness." Evangelicals have generally had

DEATHS.

the merit of sticking to each other, and, even had he been a dull man, Macaulay might have counted on the tenacity of his father's friends. It so happened that he gave the most brilliant promise in youth, and when still a very young man achieved some extraordinary works. The Evangelicals of that day were not remarkable for learning, or ability, or any kind of brilliancy, and they looked graciously on the young man who was to follow in the footsteps of his father, and to add the lustre of intellect to the beauty of holiness.

In 1830 Mr. Macaulay had made such a reputation for himself that he became M.P. for the borough of Calne—a seat then, as now, in the nomination of Lord Lansdowne. We have therefore to account for those eight years between 1822, when he took his Bachelor's degree, and 1830, when he entered the House of Commons, and to show how he fought his way upwards. For the first four of these years a good deal of his time was spent between London and Cambridge, where he had his Fellowship. He took his Master's degree in 1825, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in 1826. But far more important to his future prospects was the fact that in this period he began to write. He wrote poetry, he wrote essays, he wrote imaginary conversations, he wrote critiques, he wrote in every form. These appeared as contributions to *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*, of which it will readily be understood they formed the principal attraction. It was in these days he produced his ballads of the "Spanish Armada," the "Battle of the League," and "Ivry;" and we believe that some of his other contributions have been republished in America, although certainly not all. Macaulay was chary of publishing his periodical writings, and it is only by digging into the British Museum that we can find out what he was in the beginning. One chance, indeed, he has given us of ascertaining what he was when fresh from college. He had earned such a reputation by the contributions of which we have spoken that he was engaged to write an article on Milton for the *Edinburgh Review*. This appeared in August, 1825, and Jeffrey's opinion of it was so high that he immediately secured the services of the young essayist for future numbers. It is scarcely necessary to say that this famous paper on Milton was after-

wards republished by Macaulay in his collected essays, and we have all, therefore, an opportunity of taking his measure as a young man. In republishing it he made a few alterations, but every competent judge will endorse his own statement,—that "the criticism on Milton, which was written when the author was fresh from college, and which contains scarcely a paragraph such as his matured judgment approves, still remains overloaded with gaudy and ungraceful ornament." As he advanced, however, he improved, as will be seen in the essay on Machiavelli, which immediately follows that on Milton, but is separated from it by an interval of eighteen months. It will never be so popular as the Milton article, which is very dazzling, but it is in every way a better work, and one can see in it the Macaulay of later days—his subtlety of thought, his tolerant temper, his high view of morality, his ideal of composition; and we may say the same on the articles on Hallam and Southey, which are next in order, and belong to the period before he entered Parliament. An article on History which he contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* in May, 1828, has not been republished, and in itself perhaps it is not of much value, having very much the appearance of a college exercise touched up. But as the production of one who afterwards became one of the greatest of historians, and who, if he has not actually invented a new style of history, has given us the most perfect specimen of the new style, it is well worthy of perusal, and will, no doubt, be one day published with other works which Lord Macaulay has been perhaps too anxious to consign to oblivion. His talents were so great, his writings so effective, and his influence so strong, that the Whigs obtained for him (this, we suppose, must have been in the Coalition Ministry) an appointment as Commissioner of Bankrupts, and in 1830 he entered Parliament as Member for Calne.

For the future Mr. Macaulay is to be as much a politician as a writer. He made an impression in the House of Commons almost from the first. Immense things were expected of him when he appeared in the House; he was to be another Burke, and, indeed, he took a part in the debates in favour of Reform and the Grey Ministry second only to the more spontaneous efforts of Lord Derby, then Mr. Stanley. Croker, who had also

DEATHS.

a reputation as a reviewer, was frequently in these days set up to destroy the young debater; but he failed, as, other things being equal, the man of detail must always fail against the man of broad views and sweeping generalizations. Besides his performances on the floor of the House of Commons, Mr. Macaulay did duty in these days for his friends the Abolitionists, whose hearts he rejoiced in highly-impassioned speeches at the Freemasons' Tavern. In Parliament his style was more argumentative and sober, and he did good service to his friends. Admirable speaker as he was, however, one may venture to doubt about Mr. Macaulay's qualifications as a debater. With all his stores of information, and all his flow of language, he could never trust himself to speak without elaborate preparation; his presence as an orator was not overpowering; and his voice was not particularly good. His head was set stiff upon his shoulders, and his feet were planted immovable on the ground. One hand was fixed behind him across his back, and in this rigid attitude, with only a slight movement of his right hand, he poured forth his sentences. His speeches were what he said those of Sir James Mackintosh were—spoken essays, only that Macaulay's essays, unlike those of Sir James, were written in a highly-rhetorical style. It is, perhaps, the most rhetorical prose that ever was written; at all events, the prose that combines in the most perfect way whatever is excellent in the written with whatever is valuable in the spoken style. Macaulay certainly did wonders with it, and if he was not very formidable in extemporary debate, he managed at all times to fascinate both sides of the House, and to win golden opinions from all sorts of men.

With the new Parliament, which assembled after the passing of the Reform Bill, he was returned to the House of Commons as representative of Leeds, and was appointed Secretary to the Board of Control; but in 1834 he resigned his seat and his secretaryship to go out to India as a Member of the Supreme Council. The emolument, we believe, was the chief inducement to this step, a few years of India in such an office being sufficient to secure a competency; but it will at once be seen that the acceptance of such a post was a frank surrender on the part of Mr. Macaulay of the highest political position. A man who felt that his life was in action, and knew that he must push his way to power,

would not have thrown away some of the best years of his life in a distant dependency. He had probably discovered by this time that he was more an historian than a statesman, and that he was happier and more useful among his books than in office and in debate. And yet, although Mr. Macaulay's acceptance of the Indian office surprised those of his friends who had marked out for him, in imagination, a brilliant political future, he had an object in visiting the East which might well fire his ambition. He was appointed not simply a Member of the Supreme Council, but also legal adviser to it, and the special object of his mission was to prepare a new Indian code of law. He was therefore exempted from all share in the administration of affairs; he had four assistants to help him in his labours, and the penal code which was produced under his superintendence is mainly to be attributed to him. Containing some 26 chapters divided into nearly 500 clauses, this code was published after Mr. Macaulay's return to this country in 1838, and its great ability acknowledged. To produce such a code was an object worthy of his ambition. Unfortunately, his code was rather admired than obeyed; it was too good to be true; mankind was not fit for it; it would not work. One benefit our author derived from his Indian experience; he was able to write of Indian affairs with a fulness of knowledge and a vividness of apprehension which are unsurpassed in his treatment of any other subject. His essays on Clive and Warren Hastings are, on the whole, the best he has written. Nothing can be more masterly than his views, nothing more picturesque than his narration, nothing more just than his admiration of the men, combined with condemnation of their acts. The essays will always be the most popular of his works, and we may read them a dozen times without ever tiring of them. The English is his best, his most-finished style, and we must give him the praise of having in his style added to the clearness of the English language. He has taught us to avoid involved sentences; he has given us the most brilliant examples of directness; and by a chary use of pronouns, especially the personal pronouns, he has given at once lucidity and emphasis to all he has to say.

Mr. Macaulay, we have said, returned to this country in 1838. His subsequent history is too well known to need much remark. He was elected Member for

DEATHS.

Edinburgh in 1839, and became Secretary-at-War in the same year. Mr. Macaulay did not long remain in office, for the Whigs were soon ousted by Sir Robert Peel. At an earlier period of his life Mr. Macaulay had produced several spirit-stirring ballads, as "The Spanish Armada," "Ivry," and "Moncontour;" he now tried his powers on a larger scale, and, in 1842, gave to the world his "Lays of Ancient Rome." This work, consisting of a series of heroic ballads, was intended to embody the poet's idea of the formation of early history—some great deed embodied in recitative poetry, handed down and perhaps transmuted in a rhythmical form, and then seized upon as an authority and embodied in the annals of the historian. In 1847, on the restoration of the Whig party to power, Mr. Macaulay was appointed Paymaster to the Forces with a seat in the Cabinet. On one unfortunate occasion Mr. Macaulay expressed himself in such a manner as to give mortal offence to his constituents and powerfully to influence his future career. On the subject of the Maynooth endowment he spoke in favour of the grant to the Roman Catholics, and ventured to make allusion to "the bray of Exeter-hall." His constituency resented the expression, and refused to re-elect him in 1847. In 1852 they repented of their doings and spontaneously re-elected him, without asking him to issue an address, to attend a meeting, or to bear one farthing of the expense. It was a worthy reparation, and the historian sat for a short time again in Parliament, although an attack of heart complaint compelled him to avoid the excitement of public speaking. After a few sessions, he retired from the House of Commons, and only about two years ago he was raised to the peerage.

Lord Macaulay's rejection at Edinburgh probably hastened the undertaking of what was his chief ambition—a true History of England. He produced two volumes of this history in 1848, two more made their appearance in 1855, and the public were in expectation of a further instalment, to be issued very shortly, when they heard of the historian's decease. The excitement which the first two volumes created, appearing as they did in all the hubbub of the French Revolution, presenting to us a picture in remarkable contrast to that of the Parisian rabble, and calming down our own populace with the story of a nobler revolution, must be

vividly in the recollection of our readers. Of the value of that history we (*The Times*) have spoken so recently that we need not now trouble them with a detailed criticism. Despite of any amount of criticism, the work is a very great work, and, just as Hume is read notwithstanding our censures, Macaulay will be read, whatever his deviations from strict accuracy. The only fact about this splendid monument of human labour to which it is necessary now to call attention is, that the author in commencing his work proposed to carry it down to a period "within the memory of persons still living," and that he has not been permitted to fulfil his task. He frequently turned his attention to other works, as witness his admirable biography of the younger Pitt in a recent volume of the *Encyclopædia*; and the work had so grown on his hands that probably he himself long since gave up the hope of being able to bring down his narration to recent times. As it is, it is a magnificent fragment, which, even if the author had produced but a single volume, would have been of enormous value as a specimen of the high ideal at which he aimed.

The private character of Lord Macaulay has been set forth by his numerous friends in so amiable a light, that the reader of his delightful works feels the additional fascination that the great sentiments of temporal and eternal morality which they inculcate or illustrate, are the genuine reflex of the mind of a great and good man. His private life was in every respect exemplary. In his love for his relatives (he never married) were seen the happy affections of domestic life; he instantly acquired, and permanently retained, the love of devoted friends; his benevolence to the unsuccessful man of letters or of art was munificent; his private charities large. In those circles of London life in which he moved, his reputation was immense; he was almost unequalled as a conversationalist; his chief defect was excess: he was too brilliant, too learned,—in short, too overpowering.

The remains of the deceased poet, orator, historian, and statesman, were buried, with great solemnity, in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey, at the foot of Addison's monument, and beside the remains of Sheridan.

Nov. 26. At Toronto, very suddenly, Sir James Macaulay, late Chief Justice of

DEATHS.

the Court of Common Pleas in Upper Canada.

March. Angus Mackay, formerly Piper to Her Majesty, has been accidentally drowned in the river Nith, Dumfriesshire. Mackay was of a race of hereditary pipers, who obtained their instruction at the once-celebrated college of the Mac-Cruimins, in the isle of Skye, which has been swept away in the changes produced by the altered state of Gaelic society. He published a collection of upwards of sixty of those ancient and peculiar pieces of music called "Piobreach," with historical and biographical letter-press, which is a standard work among the military and private professors of the national instrument. He subsequently published a volume of "Reels and Strathspeys," with their respective names both in Gaelic and English, and had a considerable collection of his own composition. He was besides no contemptible versifier of poems from his native tongue.

April 17. At Millport, N.B., Lieut.-Colonel Alexander Maclean. The deceased has bequeathed the bulk of his fortune, amounting to about 30,000*l.*, to educate boys of the name of Maclean. By his will the Colonel provides that the number of boys shall not, the first year, exceed ten, and shall be increased by gradations each year till they reach 140. After the number shall have reached 140, the first 1500*l.* of surplus revenue of the trust estate which may have accumulated, shall be applied to the feuing a site for, and building and maintaining, a Gaelic church at Glasgow, to be called "Reilig Orain na Baanu Brotherly Church," the sittings in which shall be free and open to all, and especially to the poor, and to servants, soldiers, sailors, &c., who understand the Gaelic language.

April 25. At Dysart, Fifeshire, N.B., William F. Maclean, esq., eldest son of Comm.-Gen. Sir Geo. Maclean, K.C.B.

Oct. 6. Mortally wounded, while gallantly leading on his men to the assault of the fort in the island of Bate, Gulf of Cutch, East Indies, aged 20, Lieut. Jas. Wm. MacCormack, H.M.'s Twenty-eighth Regt., only son of M. J. MacCormack, M.D., Bedfordshire Militia.

March 12. At the residence of his brother-in-law, John Gurney Fry, esq., Hale-end, Woodford, aged 80, General MacInnes, of Hampstead.

June 25. Captain Theobald M'Kenna, of the First (the Royal) Regt. of Foot. He served at the siege of Sebastopol in

1855, for which he received the medal and clasp, and the order of a Knight of the Legion of Honour.

May 28. At Partis College, Bath, Ellen Ryder, widow of William Maginn, LL.D.

July 3. At his house in Upper Portland-pl., aged 89, the Right Rev. Edw. Maltby, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Durham.

The deceased was the son of Mr. George Maltby, of Norwich. He was born in St. George Tomblond, in the city of Norwich, in 1770, and went to the Norwich Grammar-school, under Dr. Parr, when only nine years of age: thus early were laid the foundations of those accomplishments which made Dr. Maltby one of the greatest scholars of the age. When Parr resigned the school at Norwich, Maltby was only fifteen, and was the head boy of the school, and was sent, by the advice of his venerable preceptor, to Winchester. Dr. Joseph Warton, the master, said he was the best and most amiable of young men. He then went to Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he gained many honours. In 1790 he obtained Sir William Browne's medals for the Greek Ode, and for the Epigrams; again in 1791 for the Greek Ode. In 1792 he gained the Craven Scholarship; and in the same year he was eighth Wrangler and senior Chancellor's Medalist. From the commencement of his honourable career Bishop Maltby had to encounter highly-gifted competitors, for his academical triumphs were gained in contests with rivals who, as was recognized in after-life, were of no ordinary talents. And when he collected the fruits of his mature studies, and edited that great repository of Greek literature, *Morell's Thesaurus*, or, as he termed it, *Lexicon Græco-Prosodiacum*, he was at once providing a most acceptable help to the young and toiling student, and delighting, and often instructing the very advanced scholar.

But Bishop Maltby had a higher view in his classical studies. He felt how important it is in a Christian divine to see if something may not be obtained from this source and rendered subservient to the noblest interests of religion. Very early, therefore, after his entrance on the sacred profession, and after he had been selected by the Bishop of Lincoln, Bishop Pretymann, to be his examining chaplain, he published his "Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion," a work which passed shortly into a second edition.

DEATHS.

For many years, from 1824 to 1833, Bishop Maltby filled the justly-coveted pulpit of Lincoln's Inn, as successor to Bishop Heber; and there—whilst he preached before his distinguished congregation, and brought to bear upon practical truths the illustrations derived from theological research—the charms of his voice and of his dignified elocution—well proved afterwards in this diocese—will be always remembered by those who heard him.

He was consecrated Bishop of Chichester in 1831, and was translated to Durham in 1836. He resigned the latter see, under Act of Parliament, in September, 1856, which took away his seat in Parliament, and left him an annuity of 4500*l*.

While filling the see of Durham, Dr. Maltby willingly devoted his wise energies and large funds to establish a new University on a permanent basis. To his unceasing care it is mainly owing that that noble foundation has taken a permanent position among our great educational institutions. Having done for it all that could be done by wise administration, he has provided the means of renewing his own fine scholarship by giving to it his invaluable library.

Jan. 13. At his residence, Shoborough, near Tewkesbury, aged 63, John William Martin, esq., a Deputy Lieutenant and Magistrate for the counties of Gloucester and Worcester.

Jan. 3. At Dublin, Henry Martley, esq., Q.C., Chief Commissioner of the Encumbered Estates Court.

Mr. Martley was called to the Irish bar in Easter Term, 1828; appointed Queen's Counsel, August, 1841; and admitted a bencher of the Hon. Society of King's Inns in Hilary Term, 1854. After a long and honourable course of general practice at the bar, he was selected by Lord Carlisle, in 1857, to fill the post of Chief Commissioner of the Encumbered Estates Court, with a salary of 3000*l*. per annum.

Nov. 7. At Budleigh Salterton, Henry William Mason, esq., late of Beel House, Amersham, Bucks, of which county he was High Sheriff and Magistrate.

June 20. Aged 45, Mr. Peter Matterson, of Low Dunsford, near Boroughbridge. The deceased and his ancestors have been the owners and occupiers of the farm on which he died for upwards of eight hundred years. (?)

Sept. 20. Aged 80, the Hon. Isabella

Elizabeth Maude, daughter of the first Viscount Hawarden.

Feb. 17. Aged 49, the Hon. William Maule, youngest son of the late Lord Panmure, and brother and heir presumptive to the present peer.

Jan. 26. At Wimpole-street, aged 64, Lydia, wife of Dr. Mayo, President of the Royal College of Physicians.

Feb. 25. At Dover, aged 84, Elizabeth, Lady Mends, relict of Commodore Sir Robert Mends, R.N.

April 12. At Entry-hill House, Bath, Selina, only surviving daughter of the late Sir Charles Granville Stuart Menteath, of Closeburn, Dumfriesshire.

May 2. At Dublin, aged 84, Sir Henry Meredith, bart., LL.D., Q.C., one of the paid Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland.

June 11. At his residence, near Vienna, aged 86, the illustrious Austrian statesman, Clement Wenceslas, Prince Metternich. The death of Prince Metternich at the very time when the sword of a Bonaparte hangs over Italy and the Treaties of Vienna are being weighed in the balance, might in an age of superstition be regarded as a solemn portent. In the age of railroads and electric telegraphs it must be recorded simply as a coincidence which acute historians may centuries hereafter regard as too symmetrical to be true. The most celebrated statesman in Europe has lived just long enough to see all the objects of his life frustrated, or, if not yet wholly frustrated, still in such jeopardy that their doom cannot long be averted. The system which he had built up with enormous labour exploded in 1848, and he was driven from the empire whose affairs he had conducted for more than the quarter of a century. When the reaction came he was enabled to return and to nourish the hope that what had been might be again. He had to wait but a very few years to discover his mistake; and the aged Prince, whose counsels at one time dominated in every European Cabinet, has gone to his rest with a *Nunc dimittis* that is anything but a song of triumph.

Clement Wenceslas Metternich was born at Coblenz on the 15th of May, 1773. His ancestors had been distinguished in the wars of the Empire against the Turks; his family had given more than one Elector to the Archbishoprics of Mayence and Treves; and his father, the Count Metternich, had obtained some reputation as a diplomatist

and as the associate of Kaunitz. In 1790 Metternich made his first public appearance as master of the ceremonies at the coronation of the Emperor Leopold II.; and in 1794, after a short visit to England, he was attached to the Austrian Embassy at the Hague, in the following year marrying the heiress of his father's friend Kaunitz. He first came into notice at the Congress of Rastadt, where he represented the Westphalian nobility, after which he accompanied Count Stadion to St. Petersburg, was (1801) appointed Minister at the Court of Dresden, then (1803-4) proceeded as Ambassador to Berlin, where he took a leading part in the arrangement of that well-known coalition which was dissolved by the battle of Austerlitz; and at length, after the peace of Presburg, was selected for the most important diplomatic appointment in the gift of the Emperor—that of Austrian Minister at the Court of Napoleon. The rise of the young Ambassador had been unusually rapid, and the French Emperor greeted him with the remark—"You are very young to represent so powerful a monarchy." "Your Majesty was not older at Austerlitz," replied Metternich, with a slight exaggeration which could not make the compliment less acceptable; and, indeed, young as he was, he exhibited an address and a knowledge before which Napoleon might bluster, but of which he could never get the better. He managed affairs at the Imperial Court with so much ability that when the war broke out in 1809, and he had to return to the Austrian Court, which was seeking refuge in the fortress of Comorn, he was appointed to the ministry of foreign affairs as the successor to Count Stadion. It was during his tenure of office that he struck out the idea of a marriage between Napoleon and an Austrian Archduchess as a means of purchasing a respite for the Empire. He conducted the negotiations with Champagny; Napoleon was divorced from Josephine; and Metternich escorted Marie Louise to Paris. It was but an expedient; it was a humiliating sacrifice, which could not be a permanent settlement; and in 1813, after the great French catastrophe in Russia, war was again formally declared by Austria against France. In the autumn of that year the grand alliance was signed at Toplitz, and on the field of Leipzig Metternich was raised to the dignity of a Prince of the Empire. In the subsequent conferences and treaties

the newly-created Prince took a very prominent part, and he signed the Treaty of Paris on behalf of Austria. He afterwards paid a visit to this country, and received the honour of a doctor's hood from the University of Oxford.

When the Congress of Vienna was opened, Prince Metternich, then in his 42nd year, was unanimously chosen to preside over its deliberations, and this presidency in the Congress may be regarded as typical of an ascendancy which, from this time, he exerted for many years in the affairs of Europe. The Continental statesmen, terrified at the fearful consequences of the French Revolution, formed themselves into a coalition to prevent the recurrence of any similar calamity; they set themselves vigorously to repress all popular institutions, to crush freedom of speech and act, and to establish a despotism in every country that would submit to it. Such were the objects of that "Holy Alliance" which has been the object of merited obloquy, which had Metternich for its presiding genius, and which for a time even contrived to obtain, if not the active assistance, at all events the tacit acquiescence of the English Ministry. It was not until Canning assumed the direction of the Foreign-office, in 1822, that this miserable compliance with blind despotism was changed into indignant protest against it. England stood alone in Europe as the champion of constitutional liberty; everywhere else the counsels of Metternich were pre-eminent—the system of "Thorough" was being rapidly developed. The blindness with which Metternich pursued this system, and strenuously opposed everything like popular rising, was apparent in the events which occurred in the Greek war of independence, the destruction of the Ottoman power, the pre-eminence of Russia in the East, and that treaty of Adrianople which put the Principalities and the Danube under her control. It has always been regarded as one of the greatest blunders of Prince Metternich that he permitted Russia to take up a position of so much danger to Austria without one word of remonstrance, without even appearing to perceive the mischief. In those days Austria had no fear of Russian aggression—her only bugbears were France and popular insurrection.

If for a moment there had been awakened a feeling of jealousy in consequence of the Russian designs, it would

DEATHS.

have been soon crushed by the events which very rapidly followed—beginning with the French Revolution of 1830. The Continental Courts drew still closer the bonds of alliance with Russia, and that Power became the head of a great confederation of Sovereigns, banded together against France. The rising nationality of the Italians was crushed with an iron hand, and the Pope and the smaller Princes of Italy became vassals of the Emperor of Austria. But the day of retribution came. In 1847 Cardinal Ferretti ascended the Papal throne. The new Pontiff declared himself on the liberal side, and his professions, as is well known, aroused all Italy, called forth the cry of national independence, and effectually shook the Austrian influence throughout the Peninsula. Then came the third French Revolution, that overturned for a time half the thrones of Europe. At Vienna, too, the shock was felt. The Government fell, in spite of the resistance of Metternich, who maintained his State policy to the last. The Emperor bowed to the storm; the Minister who had directed the affairs of half Europe for nearly half a century was displaced, and next day left the city with an escort of cavalry. He came to England, and here remained till the old state of things began to return. Not till 1851 did he venture to appear again at Vienna, but in the autumn of that year he made a sort of royal progress to his palace in the Rennweg. The old man was never again asked to undertake the cares of office. He held such a position in society as the Duke of Wellington in his latter days held in this country; and his advice was often taken in affairs of State, but really his power was gone, and many among us, perhaps, may be surprised to learn that the renowned statesman has lived until now.

In Metternich all the arts of society had been cultivated to the highest degree—his conversation brilliant and inexhaustible, his manners most easy and graceful, his flattery delicate and insinuating. Without much ardour, with very limited sympathies, with no deep convictions, he had a clear head and a firm hand; he could keep his own secret, and he could worm out the secrets of others; and, making himself the most agreeable man in the world, he plotted in the midst of smiles, manœuvred in a dance, and struck the hardest when he seemed to yield the most.

Nov. 19. Aged 79, William Mills, esq., of Saxham-hall, Suffolk, an active magistrate and promoter of works of benevolence and public usefulness.

July 29. Laura Beaumont, wife of Thomas Mills, esq., M.P., of Tolmers, Hertford.

July 31. At his residence in Eaton-sq., aged 76, the Rt. Hon. Gilbert Elliot Murray, second Earl of Minto, Viscount Melgund and Baron of Minto, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, and a baronet of Nova Scotia, G.C.B., an Elder Brother of the Trinity House, Deputy-Lieutenant of Roxburghshire, F.R.S.

The Earl of Minto, according to the rather sarcastic biographer of *The Times*, deserves a memorial at our hands, if not as a great statesman, yet as one of the great sleeping partners of the State. He was almost entirely unknown to the British public, who may have heard of his mission to Italy, or may have vaguely connected with his name the existence in the British service of a goodly number of Elliots, but without ever fully comprehending his real position in the Legislature. Not to understand that position, however, is to be ignorant of one essential point in our constitution. As he would grossly misunderstand the mechanism of a clock who should leap to the conclusion that, because the pendulum is apparently the most active thing in it, therefore it is the power which sets all else in motion, so he mistakes the mechanism of administration who imagines that Ministerial responsibility is all in all. The weights of a clock are seemingly the most lifeless, but really the most essential parts of the machinery; and Lord Minto was one of the heavy weights of the Legislature, who did his duty unregarded by the great public, that thought only of the talkative, noisy pendulums, which swing incessantly from the Treasury benches to the Opposition benches, and back again from the Opposition benches to the Treasury benches. A Ministry may be set up without these weights, but it cannot go. Thus it happened that Lord Minto, who was a poor speaker and of small public account, became, nevertheless, a considerable power in the State, and enjoyed not a little influence as a sort of chamber counsel to the Old Whigs. The public never had an opportunity of estimating Lord Minto's capacity save on one occasion, when it is well known that he contrived to do as much mischief as it is possible for a dull man to commit;

DEATHS.

but somehow he was continually placed in important positions; he was evidently a person of much consideration; he was one of those men who, no matter what their mistakes, or how little their judgment, yet never lose credit, like ordinary mortals, because they do all their feebleness with such a gravity of manner that it is impossible to believe the fault to be in them. Not only through his own personal influence, but latterly through his connection with one of our leading statesmen, did he sway the counsels of the Whig party. Lord John Russell married his second daughter in 1841, and we may add that the Colonel Romilly, who was recently a candidate for the representation of Marylebone, married another. Altogether, his weight in the councils of the nation was such that he must naturally excite the public curiosity, although his share in the public part of English history is not so marked as to afford the means of gratifying that curiosity with much important information.

Gilbert Elliot, who afterwards assumed the names of Murray and Kynynmond, was the eldest son of Sir Gilbert Elliot, the first Earl of Minto, who was descended from Gilbert Elliot, who, in the reign of Charles II., from a very humble position, rose to the dignity of a Scotch judge. Sir Gilbert won his titles in the service of the country, having been successively Ambassador at Vienna, President of the Board of Control, and Governor-General of India, besides having been twice, though unsuccessfully, proposed by the Whigs as Speaker of the House of Commons. The second Earl was born at Lyons, in November, 1782. He entered Parliament in the eventful session of 1806, as Member for Ashburton. At that time the Whigs were enduring a long exclusion from office; nor were the talents of Mr. Elliot adapted to force him into notice as a member of the Opposition. He succeeded to the earldom in 1814; but from 1806 to 1832 remained unheard of by the public. His private counsel had probably been found valuable by the Whigs, for when Parliamentary Reform had restored the party to a long lease of power, Lord Minto was placed prominently forward. He had, it is said, been trained for the diplomatic service; but he obtained no employment until, in 1832, he reached the mature age of fifty. He was then sent as Ambassador to Berlin, where he remained until 1835, when he was recalled in order to assist Lord Mel-

bourne in the responsibilities of a Cabinet. He who previously had not had the slightest acquaintance with office, and probably had but very little notion of any business whatever, was at once appointed First Lord of the Admiralty. Lord Minto held this important office until the overthrow of Lord Melbourne's Administration in 1841, and the only thing for which his rule at the Admiralty is distinguished (except, perhaps, that the expenditure of 1835 has been capriciously selected as the *datum* from which a powerful party has chosen to start in its comparisons of naval economy) is the outcry which it excited on account of the number of Elliots who crowded the naval service. Lord Minto was a good family man. He stuck to his friends; otherwise he made so little impression on the public in the capacity of First Lord that probably most of our readers have quite forgotten the fact. Partly, this is to be accounted for by the circumstance that the principal parliamentary duty of the head of the Admiralty is to move the estimates, and that Lord Minto, being a member not of the Lower but of the Upper House, could not undertake the task, which consequently fell to the Secretary. When Lord John Russell came into power in 1846, his father-in-law was intrusted with an office that entailed no necessity for work—he was made Lord Privy Seal, and retained that post until the Ministry was overthrown in 1852.

If Lord Minto had no very important duties to perform as Lord Privy Seal, he had quite enough to do in a different capacity. Towards the close of 1847 he was sent on a special mission to Italy. Lord John Russell and Pio Nono were born in the same year, and they attained the supreme power in their respective States much about the same time. It is well known that on the elevation of Cardinal Ferretti to the Pontifical chair, he set to work immediately to popularize himself, and, by the reforms which he suggested, raised the enthusiasm, not only of the Romans, but also of the whole Italian people, to the highest pitch. The name of Pio Nono resounded throughout Europe as the friend of liberty; a new day, it was imagined, had dawned on the Papedom; the golden age had returned to the land of beauty. But, unfortunately, amid much profession and much excitement, no real good was effected, and the intentions of the Pope seemed to be better than his powers of execution.

DEATHS.

In these circumstances Lord Minto was sent to Italy with instructions to assist in putting into practical and permanent form the improvements suggested by the Pontiff. In passing, he was to pat Sardinia on the back, to say something kind to Tuscany, and, after giving the best constitutional advice to the Pope, he was to drop a friendly hint, if he thought it necessary, at Naples. There were some who were not a little scandalized at the idea of an English ambassador being sent, however informally and privately, to confer with the Pope, and who felt that the mission could not end well, were it only as a flirtation with the Scarlet Lady. Lord Minto went, then, as the apostle of constitutional reform, on a missionary tour throughout Italy. What effect had this on the people? What effect had it on the princes? What was the net result to Italy? and what was the net result to England? Why, the Italian people became still more excited than before; the Italian princes became jealous, and fought every inch of ground with all that tenacity of purpose for which they are distinguished. A revolution broke out, and Italy, in the end, sank into a more desperate condition than ever. Lord Minto got no thanks for his pains, and he had the mortification ere long not only to see England parcelled out into Roman Catholic bishoprics by the Pontiff with whom his relations had been so friendly, but also to hear the Papal authorities insist upon it that when he was at Rome he was sounded as to the views of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the scheme. Perhaps a little of the fire which burned in Lord John's celebrated letter to the Bishop of Durham may be not unjustly attributed to his kinsman's chagrin. The Italian tour was the only very important part which Lord Minto played in public, and it was a failure. He never afterwards had anything ostensible to do in the management of English affairs.

The Earl of Minto married, in 1806, Mary, eldest daughter of Patrick Brydone, esq., by whom he had issue fourteen children.

April 27. At Benhall, Suffolk, aged 77, the Rev. John Mitford, B.A., vicar of that parish.

Mr. Mitford was descended from the Mitfords of Mitford Castle, in Northumberland, and nearly related to Lord Redesdale, and the historian of Greece. He was educated at Richmond and Tunbridge,

whence he went to Oriel College, Oxford, and graduated in 1809. Soon after he was admitted to orders, and presented, through the interest of his relative, Lord Redesdale, to the vicarage of Benhall. He was afterwards appointed to the livings of Weston St. Peter's and Stratford St. Andrew, both in Suffolk. Mr. Mitford devoted himself to literature with unceasing perseverance. In 1814 he published a life of the poet Gray, which is of great value, and has gone through several editions; edited a great number of our chiefest poets for the Aldine collection, and valuable correspondences of Walpole, Mason, Gray, and their contemporaries. From 1834 to 1850 he was editor of the "Gentleman's Magazine," and wrote a vast number of its articles. Mr. Mitford's acquirements and researches in every department of letters were most extensive and varied, and his pen indefatigable.

Feb. 11. At Emma-place, Stonehouse, aged 69, Major-Gen. Richard Carr Moleworth, R.A.

March 10. At Craiglockhart House, aged 85, Alexander Monro, esq., of Craiglockhart, M.D., F.R.C.P., and F.R.S., Emeritus Professor of Anatomy in the University of Edinburgh.

Jan. 8. At Ditton Park, near Windsor, Lady Montagu. Her ladyship was the only daughter of Archibald, first Lord Douglas, by his marriage with Lady Lucy Graham, daughter of William, second Duke of Montrose. She was born Dec. 21, 1779, and married, Nov. 22, 1804, Henry James Montagu Scott, the late Lord Montagu, who died in 1845.

Sept. 20. At Castlemorris, co. Kilkenny, Ireland, aged 78, Harvey de Montmorency, esq.

May 22. At Ospringe House, Kent, Lieut.-Col. Henry W. Montresor, R.A., third surviving son of the late Gen. Sir Thomas G. Montresor, K.C.H., &c.

April 9. At Stanley, Emma Jane, the wife of his Excellency Captain Thomas Edward Laws Moore, Royal Navy, Governor of the Falkland Islands.

May 6. At Hayes Park, Middlesex, aged 63, the Right Hon. Francis Stuart, eleventh Earl of Moray in the Peerage of Scotland, and Lord Stuart of Castle-Stuart in that of the United Kingdom.

April 13. At her residence in Lowndes-sq., aged 76, Sydney Lady Morgan, wife of Sir Charles Morgan, and a celebrated novelist. As she chose to have it believed, Lady Morgan was the daughter

DEATHS.

of Mr. Owenson, a musician of considerable reputation, residing at Dublin, where she was born about the year 1783, and that her father's respectable position in society, and his intellectual gifts, enabled him to introduce his daughter into the cultivated society of which she subsequently became so eminent a member.

On this subject of her birth and of her age Lady Morgan was tenaciously silent—so silent, indeed, that it provoked the malignant curiosity of her opponents. Croker constituted himself into a commission of inquiry, in which he was himself the inquisitor, judge, and reporter, into the mysteries of his brilliant countrywoman. But though even his spiteful acumen was baffled, he was rewarded by a series of supposed discoveries which amused the literary world of London for a whole season, and did his victim more injury than the revelation of the truth could have done. Lady Morgan was, in fact, the daughter of Robert MacOwen, who boasted of ancient Milesian blood, and was, besides being a man of fine presence and demeanour, an actor, manager, singer, and composer of extraordinary merit. He was, moreover, a man of no slight acquirements, sufficient to make him introducible to Dr. Johnson's famous Literary Club. His person, his versatile talents, and his Irish audacity won him the heart of an English girl, the daughter of a country gentleman of Shropshire. The old gentleman scornfully repulsed the suitor, and the Irishman settled the matter after the approved Irish fashion by eloping with the object of his affections. MacOwen, who had changed his name to Owenson on appearing on the English stage, by the advice of Garrick, does not appear to have been an unkind husband. Such was the parentage of Lady Morgan. The place of her birth is credibly said to have been the packet-boat between England and Ireland, the date some time in the year 1775. Owenson gave his daughter the best education that was possible under the conditions of perpetual change of place, the dissipation of a theatrical life, and the irregularity of the scene and the performers. This kind of teaching, or this mode of picking up knowledge, was just suited to the characteristic qualities of the little, shy, quick-witted child. She became a natural proficient in music, singing, rhyming, rattle, and repartee. Her assailants assert that she was at one time a professional actress; but this does not appear

to have been the case, though, possibly, while very young her father may have introduced her on to the stage. She showed a very precocious genius for prose and rhyme, and at fourteen produced a volume which is said to have been wondrously good *considering*. What was the education of her girlhood is not known; but it is certain that her talents must have been very diligently cultivated; and while still a girl, her playing and singing, her vivacity and many accomplishments, made her a celebrity in the viceregal circles of Dublin. At this time she showed her taste and nationality by collecting a series of ancient Irish airs, to which she composed words, and published them, thus anticipating Moore's popular work by many years. While yet not more than sixteen (it must, however, be observed that all Lady Morgan's productions and actions are dated on a false era of several years) she published two flashy novels, which were read in her own circles, and did not obtain solid praise. Having removed from the contracted circles of the Irish capital to the more ample area of London, in which her introductions and her accomplishments secured her a prominent place, she published her "Wild Irish Girl," which obtained instantaneous popularity, and made "the little wild Irish girl, with her harp and her howl," as she has described herself, a leader in fashionable literary life. She was at once a lioness and a dictator of the "blue parties." She published at this time her "Book of the Boudoir," and many miscellaneous pieces, which are complete *tableaux vivants* of the men and manners of that section of society and of that day. At the house of one of her best friends, the Marquis of Abercorn, she met Sir Charles Morgan, an eminent physician, to whom she was married while still very young. This event was, in every way, of the utmost benefit to the lady, for she was at once removed from the influences of her father's connections, and placed beyond the perils of a precarious maintenance, and permanently fixed in a position respectable in itself, and qualified for any extension which circumstances might require. But these physical and social advantages were of small account in comparison to the moral gain. Sir Charles was, in every respect, a superior man. Of large acquirements, he seems to have been endowed with a steadiness of judgment and moral worth which exercised a happy influence over

DEATHS.

his versatile and joyous wife. Henceforward her works exhibit a progressive improvement in scope and treatment; the wildness of romance was softened down, the aims were more just and lofty, the action more rational, and actuated by a higher sense of duty. Before her marriage she had published some novels full of passionate romance, which she could not herself, in after life, read without laughter. After her marriage she wrote her celebrated tale of "O'Donnel," which placed her literary fame on its true basis, as the first patriotic Irish romancer of modern times. Having formed numerous acquaintances with the continental celebrities who had visited London, and gained admission to the brilliant society in which she reigned supreme, Sir Charles and Lady Morgan visited France, and the results of her large opportunities and shrewd observation were published in a book, nominally of travels, but in fact a critical review of the social state of that country. It is indeed an excellent book, and indispensable to those who would form a correct idea of the society of Paris during that period of the Restoration. The work had immense success, and made a great reputation for the writer. The French Court was so exasperated at the unfavourable criticisms of the sarcastic authoress, that she was forbidden to return to France—a restriction which the lively lady laughed to scorn, and on her route to Italy, at a subsequent period, passed some time in the capital without being subjected to molestation or annoyance. In England, however, the consequences were much more serious; for her views were taken up in a party spirit by the bad Tory press of those times, and Lady Morgan was attacked with a virulence and pertinacity which would be painful were it read in our more pacific days. The lady resisted these assaults with unflinching spirit, wit, and vivacity; she was backed by a talented party and numerous friends, and the result proved that her observations were as just as they were shrewd and biting. Her second great novel, "Florence Macarthy," was published during her residence in France, and sustained her reputation. It is impossible to relate all the incidents of a literary career extending, with unceasing activity, over half a century. Lady Morgan's next great work bore the same relation to Italy that her first does to France, and abounds in the same shrewdness of observation and fearlessness of remark

that characterized that production. After the death of Sir Charles, Lady Morgan was engaged in the preparation of her "Diary"—the story of her life—which she had completed shortly before her death. It is a work worthy of her former productions, and is fully equal to the best of its kind. Treating of persons and scenes now long departed, it reads with all the perspective of a time long past. In fact, the still-vivid authoress had outlived her time, and the scenes in which she took part are matters of history, and the people with whom she associated those of a bygone generation. In reading her life, the allusions to public events long since past make it difficult to realize that she was so recently among us, while the freshness and vivacity with which she recounts her adventures vivify the events of which she speaks to a degree that makes her work valuable as a contribution to history, independently of the interest that attaches to it on account of the writer herself. Lady Morgan, although receiving large sums for her works, was not wealthy; and a well-bestowed pension of \$300. a-year was bestowed upon her during the ministry of Earl Grey. Lady Morgan has left no issue. Her only sister, Lady Clarke, who long enjoyed a high position in the society of Dublin, predeceased her.

June 13. At Brompton, aged 68, the Rev. John Morison, D.D., LL.D., late pastor of the Congregational Church at Chelsea, and for thirty-two years editor of the "Evangelical Magazine," and author of numerous religious works.

Sept. 20. At Farley Court, Berks, by an accident, Lieut.-Gen. Morse, H.M.'s Indian Forces.

June 7. At Rolleston Hall, aged 79, Lady Mosley, wife of Sir O. Mosley, bart.

Dec. 17. At his residence, Bath-easton Court, aged 80, the Ven. C. A. Moysey, D.D., nineteen years Archdeacon of Bath; but he resigned all his church preferments in 1839. Doctor Moysey was the son of A. Moysey, esq., one of the Welsh judges, and M.P. for Bath.

Oct. 18. At Montpelier, France, aged 67, Joseph Randolph Mullings, esq., of Eastcourt, Wilts, late M.P. for Cirencester.

March 7. At his residence, Great Stuart-st., Edinburgh, in his 81st year, Sir John Archibald Murray, knt., titular Lord Murray, an eminent Scotch judge. His Lordship was the second son of Alexander Murray, of Henderland, Lord of Session and Justiciary. He was called to

DEATHS.

the Scottish bar in 1799; succeeded the Right Hon. Francis (afterwards Lord) Jeffrey as Lord Advocate in 1834, but resigned in the November of the same year; was again appointed Lord Advocate in April, 1835; was Recorder of the Great Roll, or Clerk of the Pipe, in the Exchequer Court, Scotland, but resigned that office (a sinecure) some time before his appointment as Lord Advocate; and represented the Leith district of burghs in Parliament from 1832 till 1838. In 1839 he was raised to the bench as a Lord of Session, and received the honour of knighthood on that occasion. Lord Murray was the last, save only the venerable Lord Brougham, of that highly-distinguished band who, throughout the first thirty or forty years of the century, reflected more lustre on Edinburgh than did even the great intellectual lights of an elder day, and which included such names as Jeffrey, Playfair, Sidney Smith, Francis Horner, Thomas Brown, and Henry Cockburn.

Sept. 17. At Paris, aged 78, Major the Hon. Charles Murray, third son of David, second Earl of Mansfield.

March 28. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, aged 95, Ann, widow of Vice-Adm. Sir George Murray, K.C.B.

July 7. At Whiting-bay, co. Waterford, Ireland, Sir Richard Musgrave, bart.

May 16. At Madrid, Philip, eldest son of Sir Geo. Musgrave, bart., of Eden Hall, Cumberland.

May 10. At her residence, near Liverpool, aged 37, Mrs. Susan Cushman Muspratt, well known before her marriage as the accomplished actress, Susan Cushman.

May 22. At Naples, aged 49, his Majesty Ferdinand II., King of Naples and Sicily.

Ferdinand II. was born on the 22nd of January, 1810, and was the son of Francis I., by his second wife, Isabella Maria, the Infanta of Spain. He ascended the throne of the Two Sicilies in 1830. The whole kingdom was at that time in a state of utter disorganization, and threatened every day to break into open insurrection. Ferdinand, however, whatever might be his other faults, was a man of firmness and energy. He had also important advantages on his side. He was popular with the army and the lazzaroni of Naples, the nobility were alarmed at the revolutionary doctrines then in the ascendant, and he was firmly allied to Austria. He was, with such appliances, able to keep his people in subjection until the

revolutionary days of 1848. On the 12th of January in that year the flag of revolt was raised at Palermo. The struggle was severe: the troops retired into the fortifications, and bombarded the city. After terrible bloodshed and destruction, the foreign Ministers interfered, the royal troops were withdrawn, and Ferdinand promised a Constitution. But in the meanwhile the revolt had spread over the whole island. At Messina some sanguinary contests took place, in which the populace, as at Palermo, drove the troops into the forts, and the city was subjected to a terrible bombardment. The Sicilian insurrection was aided by an insurrection which broke out at Naples on the 15th of May. Here also a most sanguinary struggle ensued—such atrocities indeed were perpetrated that the French Admiral threatened to land a force to put a stop to the barbarities. But at Naples the king's cause was supported by the lazzaroni, who met the revolutionary populace with kindred ferocity. Their knives gave a material assistance to the cannon and bayonets of the soldiery, and the King remained master of his capital. This was the turning point of the King's fortunes. The Sicilians, assembled in Chambers at Palermo, declared the King deposed, and elected the Duke of Genoa, son of the King of Sardinia, to reign over them. The Duke, however, thought it prudent to decline the honour; and the King, now secure in his continental territories, gathered his troops for subduing the Sicilian revolt. On the 2nd September, the fleet commenced a terrible attack on Messina, the troops were landed, and after four days' bombardment, by which a large part of the city was laid in ruins, the revolt was compelled to surrender. The Royal forces had, however, the whole island, abounding in strong positions and inhabited by a brave and exasperated population, to subdue. At Palermo the insurrectionary Chambers still sat, and made energetic efforts to maintain the rebellion. So determined were the revolt, and so inaccessible the country, that the troops were unable to advance from Messina until the following year. The Sicilians offered a desperate resistance, but were everywhere defeated. The most horrible cruelties were perpetrated by the combatants, the towns and villages were laid waste, and the country along the coast reduced to a desert. Catania was taken, after a bombardment which laid it in ruins; Syra

DEATHS.

cuse surrendered without resistance; and on the 28th April Palermo capitulated, and the insurrection was subdued.

Since that time the subjects of the King of the Two Sicilies have crouched under the rod of the most terrible despotism in modern times. Not an arm dared be raised, not a whisper breathed, but the universal police heard and punished. The state prisons were crowded with the best and bravest, the meekest and most insignificant, of the Neapolitan people. The cruelties, the shames of these infernal abodes, known by subdued report, and brought to light in their full enormity by a British statesman, have passed a shudder through the civilized world. The English and French Governments attempted, by friendly advice, to induce the King to relax his iron rule, but their advice was scornfully rejected; and they withdrew their Ministers from his wretched Court. Under this diplomatic ban the King and Court of Naples have remained, unrelenting and defiant; and the sovereign has gone to his terrible account and made no sign.

July 10. At Melbourne, from a fall from his horse, Col. Neill, Deputy-Adj.-Gen. of Victoria, brother to Gen. Neill, who fell at Delhi.

Sept. 15. At Thorney-hall, Notts, aged 56, Gertrude, wife of the Rev. Christopher Neville.

Feb. 15. In Little Ryder-st., London, aged 59, the Rev. Sir John Newport, bart., only surviving son of the late William Newport, esq., of Waterford, and nephew of the late Right Hon. Sir J. Newport, bart., M.P., of New-park, co. Kilkenny, Comptroller-General of the Exchequer.

Sept. 19. At Glenburn House, Rothesay, N.B., aged 55, John Pringle Nichol, LL.D., Professor of Astronomy in the University of Glasgow.

Dr. Nichol is one other of those men whom Scotland produces from her lower ranks to raise themselves to eminence by their own industry and talent. He was born 13th January, 1804, in the town of Brechin, Forfarshire, in which his father was a respectable trader. He there received such an education as was calculated to qualify him for a commercial profession; but he showed such talent and energy that his friends were persuaded to give him an education that would fit him for the Church. He was accordingly sent to the college at Aberdeen, where he distinguished himself even more amongst

his fellow-students than he had done amongst the scholars of the Brechin Academy. At the early age of seventeen, he accepted the appointment of teacher of the parish school of Dun, which he left for a similar, but more important, situation in Hawick. This he left for Cupar, and that again for Montrose, where, of all these places, he is still most known, and where the improving influence it was his habit to exercise was most effectual. As Rector of Montrose Academy, he frequently delivered lectures upon light, heat, electricity, and astronomy, which he elucidated with such apt experiments and such eloquence as made him afterwards so popular with every audience to whom he explained the wonders of science. In due time he was licensed as a preacher of the Gospel. He did not, however, meet with success as a preacher; and he therefore abandoned theological study, and devoted himself to the more congenial science of astronomy. He soon acquired a wide fame by his essays and lectures upon this ennobling and difficult science; so that his appointment, in 1836, as Professor of Astronomy in the Glasgow University, gave the greatest satisfaction to both the students and the general public. But Dr. Nichol's usefulness was not confined to the Glasgow University alone. He was often seen discoursing upon his favourite theme to crowds of artisans in the mechanics' institutions in Glasgow and the various towns and villages of Scotland, and appeared to take as much delight in explaining the laws that regulate the heavenly bodies to the unpretending mechanic as to the carefully-educated student. It would be hard to find another in Scotland that has done more to spread information by public lectures, or to make mechanics' institutions popular. He has enriched English literature by various works—each and all written with marked felicity, power, and beauty of expression. Amongst these may be mentioned, "The Architecture of the Heavens," "The Planet Neptune," "The Cyclopædia of the Physical Sciences," "The Solar System," and "The Planetary System." Beyond his scientific pursuits, Dr. Nichol was an instructed and able man, and had a high place in the society of Glasgow.

May 29. At sea, whilst on his passage to England for the benefit of his health, Bosvargus Toup Nicolas, esq., Acting Queen's Commissioner and Consul-General for the Sandwich Isles.

H H

VOL. CI.

DEATHS.

Aug. 25. At her residence, Belgrave-sq., London, the Countess-Dowager of Norbury. The late Countess was only daughter and heiress of William Brabazon, esq., of Brabazon-park, co. Mayo, and married, January 1, 1808, the Earl of Norbury, who was murdered at his seat in Ireland in January, 1839.

Sept. 7. At Ashurst Lodge, Sunningdale, aged 66, Sir William Norris, late Recorder of Penang.

Jan. 20. At Northwick Park, Gloucestershire, aged 89, the Right Hon. John Rushout, Baron Northwick of Northwick Park, Worcestershire, in the Peerage of England, and a Baronet.

The deceased Peer was the eldest son of the first baron, and was born in 1770. For some reason now unknown, his father did not impart to him the advantages usually accorded to the heir to a peerage and a vast property. He was not sent to any of our public schools, nor to an English university, but was educated at a school at Hackney, and thence sent to Neufchâtel. In 1790 he visited Italy and remained in that country until 1800, when his father's death summoned him to England to succeed to the title and a large fortune. During his residence on the Continent, his lordship made the acquaintance of many, and the friendship of some, of the most eminent men of the day, both Englishmen and foreigners. Among the latter were Gibbon, Nelson, Sir William Hamilton and his famous wife, Payne Knight, Agincourt, Canova, and Camuccini. He was the first man in Europe to receive the news of the victory of the Nile, and that from the lips of Nelson himself, the *Téméraire* having stranded in the Bay of Palermo, at which place Lord Northwick was then residing. He was also connected with another remarkable incident in the life of our great Admiral—unfortunately, as great a blot on his fame as the preceding event was one of its brightest spots: for he was at Nelson's table in the flagship when a gun announced the execution of Caraccioli. It is clear that his lordship had at this time formed those tastes in which he afterwards indulged with such princely munificence; for his intimates were all men remarkable in the world of art. From Sir William Hamilton he derived his love of antique art, and was engaged with that distinguished connoisseur and the not less eminent Payne Knight in the purchase of several collections of coins and other articles of *vertu*. The

extent and value of the magnificent collections at Northwick Park and Thirlestaine House will be best appreciated by a reference to those parts of this volume which chronicle the sales of his paintings and coins. The former alone, it will be seen, produced in the aggregate nearly 100,000*l*.

Lord Northwick's long residence abroad and his acquaintance with so many men of the highest eminence in literature and the arts, and long since reckoned among a past generation, gave to his conversation a charm which cannot be supplied. His pleasant talk, refined by delicate observation and a refined taste, abounded in personal anecdotes of those who have long held the highest places in the history of the politics, literature, and artistic tastes of the country. Lord Northwick was a member of the Dilettante Society,—indeed, he was the senior member by twenty years. His lordship never married, and is succeeded in his title and real estates by his nephew Col. Rushout. He died without a will, and the dispersion of his fine collections is a necessary consequence.

Oct. 13. At Paris, aged 30, Fletcher Cavendish Charles Conyers Norton, esq., attaché to the English Embassy at Paris, eldest son of the Hon. George C. and Mrs. Norton, of Kettlethorpe Hall, Norfolk. Mr. Norton entered the diplomatic service in December, 1847, as attaché to the Legation at Lisbon. He was afterwards attached to the Legations of Naples and Brussels, and in August, 1854, was appointed second paid attaché at Paris.

Feb. 16. At his residence, Ballenlough Castle, co. Westmeath, aged 58, Sir John Nugent, bart., Chamberlain to the Emperor of Austria, a Major in the Austrian army, and a Deputy-Lieut. for Westmeath.

Nov. 29. At Westbourne-terr., Hannah, widow of Rear-Admiral Sir R. O'Connor, K.C.H.

June 21. At Edinburgh, Lieut. David Ogilvy, late of the old Ninety-fourth (or Scotch Brigade) Regt. He had received the war medal with eight clasps.

Feb. 3. At Brussels, aged 56, Sir Chaloner Ogle, bart., only son of the late Sir Charles Ogle, Admiral of the Fleet. The deceased was formerly in the army, but retired several years ago. He succeeded to the title only in June, 1858.

July 15. At Fort Fergus, co. Clare, the Hon. and Venerable Archdeacon O'Grady.

March 9. In London, aged 65, Sir

DEATHS.

Anthony Oliphant, C.B., formerly Chief Justice of Ceylon; third son of the late Ebenezer Oliphant, esq., of Condie, Perth. Sir Anthony was educated at Hyde Abbey School, near Winchester. He was called to the bar first at Edinburgh, and subsequently to the English bar at Lincoln's-inn in 1821. In 1826 he was appointed Attorney-General at the Cape of Good Hope, from which post he was promoted in 1838 to the Chief Justiceship of Ceylon. He held that appointment down to the year 1855, when he retired on the usual pension. He received the honour of knighthood in 1839, and was created a Companion of the Order of the Bath, civil division, in 1848.

June 5. At Old Brompton, in his 71st year, Charles Ollier, a gentleman well known and much respected in literary circles. He was, in his earlier life, in business as a bookseller and publisher, and brought out some of the earlier works of Keats and Shelley. He subsequently took the professional side of literature, writing some novels and poems, which had their reputation in their time—among them “Inesilla” and “Atham and his Wife.” He was also a frequent contributor to our periodical literature, and was much employed as an editor of magazines. For many of his latter years Mr. Ollier was a kind of “consulting physician” on the merits of works offered to the London publishers, and was much engaged in putting into a readable form works of value by authors whose experience in the journey-work of literature was crude or non-existent.

May 23. At the College of Nobles, Naples, the Right Rev. Dr. Olliffe, Roman Catholic Bishop of Calcutta. The deceased Prelate, who was only 45 years old, was returning to Ireland, his native country, for the improvement of his health, which had become seriously impaired by the unwearied zeal with which he discharged the onerous duties of his mission during a long residence in India.

Aug. 12. At Tunbridge Wells, aged 79, Cosmo Orme, esq., of No. 15, Bryanston-sq., formerly partner in the eminent publishing house of Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green. Mr. Orme was a native of Scotland, and having come to London for employment was so fortunate as to obtain a situation as clerk in Longman's house. His diligence and talent won him the esteem of

his employers, and about 1808 he was admitted a partner. In 1841 he withdrew from the firm on a moderate competence. He did not forget the chances of a business in which he was himself so successful, and has bequeathed 300*l.* to the Booksellers' Provident Institution, of which he was one of the founders; and 700*l.* to the Booksellers' Retreat, to which during life he had been a liberal benefactor.

March. At the house of her grandson-in-law, Mr. Robert Pemberton, Fielden's Arms, Blackburn, aged 103, Mrs. Elizabeth Osborne, a native of Middleton.

May 25. At Pluckey Rectory, aged 46, William Dixwell Oxenden, esq., youngest son of the late Sir Henry Oxenden, bart., of Broome, Kent.

Jan. 14. At Lowndes-square, Maria Frances, widow of George D'Oyley, D.D., F.R.S., Rector of Lambeth and Sunbridge.

Sept. 21. At Twyford Hall, Norfolk, aged 73, Lieut.-Col. Paoke.

Feb. 18. At Hampton Court Palace, aged 74, Sophia, widow of the Hon. Berkeley Paget.

June 18. At Brussels, William Handcock Parkinson, M.D., F.R.C.S., many years resident English surgeon at that city.

May 29. In Manchester-sq., aged 54, Robert Pashley, esq., one of H.M.'s Counsel, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Assistant-Judge of the Middlesex Sessions, and Steward of Knaresborough.

Mr. Pashley was descended from a respectable family in Yorkshire, and was educated at Cambridge, where he was a Wrangler and a First-Classman. In 1830 he was elected a travelling Fellow of Trinity College; and published a very interesting account of his journeys in Italy, Greece, Turkey and Asia Minor. In 1837 he was called to the bar by the Society of the Inner Temple. He went, at first, the Western Circuit, which he soon left for the Northern, and joined the West Riding Sessions, where his rapidly-increasing business led in time to distinction on Circuit and in Westminster Hall, where his particular power lay in arguing appeals from sessions, particularly those which arose under the new Poor-law Act. In 1851 he was appointed one of Her Majesty's Counsel, and elected a Bencher of the Inner Temple. In 1856 he succeeded the late Mr. Serjeant Adams in the office

DEATHS.

of Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions.

Nov. 13. Suddenly, during divine service at St. Thomas's Church, Douglas, Isle of Man, John Crofton Peddie, esq., late Lieut.-Col. Commanding the Twenty-first Fusiliers and Forty-first Regts.

Oct. 28. Suddenly, at her house in Privy-gardens, Lady Peel, widow of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel.

Her ladyship had passed the evening with the Countess Dowager of Jersey, just now mourning the loss of a husband and an eldest son, and appeared in her accustomed health. She left Lady Jersey about ten o'clock, and on returning home retired to rest, her female attendant occupying an adjoining apartment. In the morning, on the maid entering Lady Peel's room, she discovered her ladyship insensible and apparently dead in bed. Medical aid was directly summoned, but the only result was to show that death had probably taken place some hours previously. Lady Peel was the second daughter of General Sir John Floyd, bart., by Rebecca, daughter of Mr. Charles Drake. Her marriage with the late Sir Robert Peel took place on the 8th of June, 1820, in the drawing-room of her mother's residence in Upper Seymour-st., and was attended with the happiest results. Her ladyship was remarkable for personal beauty, and among the pictures of the late Sir Robert Peel is a portrait of the deceased lady in a hat, painted by Sir Thomas Lawrence, and forming a companion to Rubens' "Chapeau de Paille," for which latter Sir R. Peel gave the large sum of 3500 guineas.

Her ladyship's remains were interred in the family vault at Drayton Bassett Church by the side of those of the lamented statesman.

July 24. At Deighton's Hotel, Harrogate, aged 38, Henry William de la Poer Beresford Peirse, esq., of Bedale-hall, Yorks.

At Lucknow, the Hon. Major Babbington Pellew, the third surviving son of the late Pownall Viscount Exmouth.

This gallant officer served in the harassing Caffre war with the Forty-third Foot. During the Russian war he served with the Rifle Brigade in the Crimea, where he participated in the assault on the Redan. On that occasion he received two wounds in the leg, and his name was afterwards included in the list of those who had specially distinguished themselves in the assault. He distinguished

himself by his exertions at the great explosion, and at the close of the war was aide-de-camp to General van Straubenzee. He accompanied the General to China in the same capacity, and shared in the storming of Canton. After that event he voluntarily relinquished his staff appointment, set off for India, and joined his battalion just in time to assist in the final assault on Lucknow. After this, the second battalion of the Rifle Brigade was attached to the *corps d'armée* of Sir Hope Grant, to which has been assigned a large portion of those harassing operations for the subjugation of Oude, which have proved fatal to this brave officer and to so many more of our brave defenders.

July 7. In Wimpole-st., aged 78, Elizabeth, widow of G. H. D. Pennant, esq., of Penrhyn-castle, North Wales, and daughter of the late Hon. William and Lady Bridget Bouverie.

Aug. 7. At his residence near Clonmel, co. Tipperary, aged 90, the Right Hon. Richard Pennefather, ex-Baron of her Majesty's Court of Exchequer in Ireland. During his long life he was an honour to the bar, the bench, and his country. In private life he was as much beloved as he was respected by the public at large.

Sept. 16. After a few hours' illness, having joined his family on the previous day, apparently in good health, Spencer Perceval, esq., eldest son of the murdered Prime Minister, the late Right Hon. Spencer Perceval.

March 24. At Plumstead, Kent, in the neighbourhood of which he had resided for the past half-century, aged 74, Sir Edward Bindloss Perrott, bart. He was descended from the celebrated Perrotts of the reigns of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth.

Feb. 1. In Golden-sq., aged 70, Charles Phillips, esq., Commissioner of the Insolvent Debtors' Court.

Mr. Phillips was a native of Sligo. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the Irish bar in the year 1812, and to the English bar, as a member of the Middle Temple, Feb. 9, 1821. His brilliant but florid eloquence, and other qualities, proved so well suited to Old Bailey practice, that for many years he was accounted the leading criminal counsel. He was appointed by Lord Chancellor Brougham to the District Court of Bankruptcy at Liverpool, in which he sat for some years; and in 1835, on the removal of Sir David Pollock to be

DEATHS.

Chief Judge at Bombay, he was transferred to the Insolvent Debtors' Court, as one of the Commissioners. Mr. Phillips had also strong literary inclinations, was a fervid poet, wrote a capital biography of Curran, and, besides, some professional treatises, and a work on the philosophy of capital punishments which is of real value.

July 12. At Hathern Rectory, near Loughborough, aged 75, and in the 51st of his incumbency, the Rev. E. T. March Phillips, Rector of Hathern, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Gloucester, younger son of the late Thomas March Phillips, esq., of Garendon-park, and younger brother of S. M. Phillips, esq., late Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

Feb. 20. At Hyde Vale, Blackheath, aged 87, Commander Peter Giles Pickernell. The gallant Commander, who had been in several gallant affairs with the enemy, was second Lieutenant of the *Revenge* at the battle of Trafalgar, and when Lieutenant of the same ship, in 1806, assisted at the capture of four French frigates. He commanded the *Gallant* and a division of gunboats in the Walcheren expedition in 1809.

June 7. At Eagle-hill, co. Galway, Margaret, wife of Capt. Henry Pigott, and daughter of Sir Scrope Bernard Morland, bart., of Nether Winchindon, Bucks.

Nov. 11. Off Ghazepore, on the Ganges, Col. F. G. A. Pinckney, C.B., commanding Her Majesty's Seventy-third Regt.

Dec. 26. At Chichester, aged 77, Major T. Pipon, formerly of the Seventh Hussars. He served through the Peninsular war, and was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for the county of Hants.

Jan. 12. At his residence in Dublin, aged 82, Sir James Pitcairn, M.D., Inspector General of Hospitals, Fellow of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons in England and Ireland, and an Inspector General of the Army. Sir James served at the Helder, in 1799, and the whole of the campaign in Egypt, in 1801.

Jan. In his 84th year, Anne Charles Lebrun, Duke of Placentia, Grand Chancellor of the Legion of Honour, and a Senator. The Duke was the eldest son of Charles Lebrun, one of the most distinguished civilians of the Great Revolution: who, in 1799, on the retirement of Sieyes and Duclos, was nominated one of Napoleon's subordinate Consuls; and had a considerable share in drawing up the *Code Napoleon*. He was afterwards made Arch-Treasurer of the Empire, and Duke

of Placentia. The deceased served in the army of the Empire with distinction, was Colonel of Hussars at Marengo, General of Brigade at Eylau, and a General of Division, with the title of Count, in the Russian campaign of 1812. In 1814, at the Restoration, he gave in his adhesion to the new order of things; but having, during "The Hundred Days," accepted a command in Champagne, and the post of Deputy in the Legislative Body, he was placed *en desponibilité* after Waterloo. He succeeded to his father's titles in 1825. The Revolution of 1848 brought the officers of the first Emperor again into favour. The Duke regained his ancient position, and was appointed to the dignified post of Grand Chancellor of the Legion of Honour. He was buried, as became his rank, with great military pomp, in the cemetery of Père la Chaise.

Aug. 7. At Kingstown, the Hon. Patrick Plunket, one of the Judges of the Irish Court of Bankruptcy; fourth son of the late Lord Plunket.

April 2. At Nice, aged 43, Georgina, wife of Lord Polwarth, of Mertoun-house, Berwickshire, third daughter of the late Geo. Baillie, esq., and sister to the present Earl of Haddington.

April 16. At Dalkey, near Dublin, aged 75, William Edward Porter, esq., late Clerk of Recognizances to the High Court of Chancery in Ireland.

July 16. Of sore throat, having completed her 22nd year the day before her lamented decease, Her Majesty Stephanie, Queen Consort of Portugal. Her Majesty was a princess of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, and was cousin to our Queen and to the Prince Consort. She was married to Don Pedro V., King of Portugal, on the 18th May, 1858, and had, therefore, been married little more than a twelvemonth.

April 21. At Sion-pl., Sion-hill, aged 63, Lieut.-Col. Percy Pratt.

March 24. At Brighton, Sir John Lewes Predder, knt., late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Van Diemen's Land.

March 20. At Highgate-rise, Michael Prendergast, esq., Q.C., Judge of the City Sheriff's Court. The learned gentleman was called to the bar by the hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, 20th Nov., 1820, and was for many years Recorder of Norwich. He was elected Judge of the Sheriff's Court some two years ago.

June 23. Aged 69, in Dover-st., Piccadilly, the Rev. G. Pretymann, Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral and Canon of Winchester. The deceased, who was the

DEATHS.

second son of Dr. Tomline, first Bishop of Lincoln and then of Winchester, had held the Chancellorship of Lincoln Cathedral—returned as worth 1750*l.* per annum, but really worth, with its appurtenances, a great deal more—for nearly half a century, and with it a prebend of Stoke, in Lincoln Cathedral (which included the living and also the curacies of Elston, Coddington, and Syerston, value 402*l.* per annum), and the perpetual curacy of Nettleham, Lincolnshire. He also held the living of Chalfont, Bucks (returned as worth 615*l.* per annum), and the living of Wheathamstead, Herts, together with the curacy of Harpenden, returned as worth 1356*l.* per annum, for upwards of 40 years. He was a Canon of Winchester Cathedral, valued at 913*l.* per annum; Prebend of Biggleswade in Lincoln Cathedral, and also patron of the Vicarage, worth 300*l.* per annum, and impropriator of the great tithes. The Chaplaincy of the Hospital of St. Leonard's, Newark, is also said to have been held by him.

Jan. 28. At Boston, United States, aged 62, the celebrated American historian, William Hickling Prescott.

Mr. Prescott, says an American journalist, belonged to a New England family of high honour. His grandfather, Col. William Prescott, commanded the American forces at the battle of Bunker's Hill. His father, Judge Prescott, was one of the best and wisest men who have ever lived and died amongst us. He was a lawyer in a very large practice for a great many years, and a very acute, successful, and learned jurist. Mr. Prescott was born in Salem, Massachusetts, May 4, 1796, and resided there until his father's removal to Boston, when he was 12 years old. He entered Harvard College in 1811, and graduated in 1814. While in college he was deprived by an accident of the use of one eye, and the sight of the other was so impaired as to prevent him from engaging in any occupation in which the constant use of that organ should be necessary. Happily his father's circumstances were such as to preclude the necessity of his toiling for bread. He early determined to devote himself to a life of literature. Soon after leaving college, being advised to travel, he went to Europe and spent two years in an extended journey through England, France, and Italy; and at the end of it returned home in excellent general health, but with no great improvement in the state of his eyes.

His marriage soon after took place;

and from this period his days flowed on in diligent and uneventful devotion to literary pursuits. He was never enabled to use his own eyes but for a short time in the day, but was constantly obliged to use the eyes of others for his studies and researches, as well as to record the results of them. His quiet perseverance and continuous industry enabled him to triumph over this difficulty, and to achieve an amount of literary production which is not merely most honourable to his intellectual powers, but conveys a noble moral lesson to all who may be burdened with similar trials. His earliest literary efforts were contributions to the *North American Review*, upon subjects drawn from Spanish, English, American, and especially Italian literature. Indeed, at one time he contemplated an extended work upon Italian literature.

After some deliberation and hesitation, he selected the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella as the subject of an extended historical work; and to this the assiduous labour of many years was cheerfully and patiently given. He drew his materials not merely from all printed sources, but he was enabled to procure many manuscript authorities which no writer before him, at least in English, had been able to gain access to. The work was published in 1838, in three volumes, under the title of the "History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic." This admirable production was received with the utmost enthusiasm both in Europe and America. Scholars and philosophers admired its depth of research, while general readers were charmed by the limpid ease and natural grace of its style, its brilliant descriptions and animated pictures. It was translated into French, Spanish, and German. Its author was immediately elected a member of the Royal Academy of Madrid. The popularity which it gained upon its first publication it has since steadily maintained, and it is now one of the established classics in the English language.

Mr. Prescott's literary industry was not checked by the success of his first work. He did not, for a moment, repose under his laurels. He immediately devoted himself to the investigation of another brilliant period in the history of Spain, the fruits of which appeared in 1843, in a work, in three volumes, called the "History of the Conquest of Mexico, with a Preliminary View of the Ancient Mexican Civilization, and the Life of the

DEATHS.

Conqueror, Hernando Cortez." This work was received with a favour not less than that which had greeted the "History of Ferdinand and Isabella." The literary world recognized in it the same careful research, the same accuracy of statement, the same persuasive sweetness and magic beauty of style.

In 1847 was published, in two volumes, the "History of the Conquest of Peru, with a Preliminary View of the Civilization of the Incas," a work of kindred and commensurate excellence to that of the "History of the Conquest of Mexico."

Mr. Prescott now devoted himself with unabated ardour to the preparation of a work of wider range and broader scope—a work which, alas! he has not been permitted to finish—the "History of the Reign of Philip II." This was a theme requiring a larger and more comprehensive treatment than his previous works, and Mr. Prescott made his preparations for it with an extent and deliberation proportionate to its magnitude. He had now become one of the great literary names of the age, and found everywhere persons who were ready to give him assistance. Everywhere, both public collections and private archives were thrown open to him. It was while preparing for this work that he indulged himself with a brief excursion to England, where he was received with the utmost enthusiasm by persons of the highest distinction in literature and social life, and where the favourable impression created by his works was confirmed by his prepossessing appearance and delightful manners. He took ample time for the task, which he destined to be the crowning work of his life. In the latter part of 1855 appeared the first two volumes of this work, under the title of the "History of the Reign of Philip II., King of Spain." The highest expectations of the public were gratified by it. In dealing with this more comprehensive subject, it was admitted that he had shown the same careful research, the same conscientious balancing of authorities, the same calm and judicial temper, and that it was recommended to the general taste by the same picturesque narrative and the same fascination of style. The third volume was published a few weeks only before the historian was taken from the scene of his studies.

In 1856 Mr. Prescott published an edition of Robertson's "History of the Reign of Charles V.," with notes, and a valuable supplement, containing an account

of the Emperor's life after his abdication.

The highest possible acknowledgments of literary distinction were liberally showered upon Mr. Prescott. The University of Oxford, in 1850, conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws. In 1845 he received the highest of all distinctions of its class, in being elected a Corresponding Member of the class of moral and political philosophy in the French Institute, succeeding Navarete, the Spanish historian. Of most of the learned societies in Europe he was a member.

Mr. Prescott was as rich in the love of his friends as in the admiration of the literary world. His manners were most frank, simple, and engaging; his social nature was strong and active; and his sympathies were ever ready and easily moved. His countenance was extremely fine and prepossessing, and retained to the last a youthful glow and animation which were the faithful expression of a sunny temper and an ever young heart. No man was ever more warmly beloved; no man could show a better title to the affections of his friends. His honours and distinctions never impaired the simplicity and sweetness of his nature, or changed his countenance towards any one whom he had ever known and loved. No man so eminent was ever pursued with less of envy, detraction, or ill-will. No man's honours were ever a subject of more hearty delight to his friends.

Mr. Prescott leaves a widow and three children—two sons and a daughter.

Oct. 31. At Torwoodlee, Selkirkshire, Vice-Admiral James Pringle, of Torwoodlee.

Feb. 21. At the Cedars, Putney, aged 67, William Pritchard, esq., High-bailiff of Southwark.

Feb. 2. At Twickenham, aged 88, the Rev. Charles Proby, Canon of Windsor.

Feb. 6. Anne, wife of Admiral Sir William Beauchamp Proctor, bart., of Langley Park, Norfolk.

May 13. At his residence, Aberhafesp Hall, Montgomeryshire, aged 74, Lieut.-General Henry Adolphus Proctor, C.B.

April 12. At Windsor, aged 63, Colonel George Walter Prosser, late Lieut.-Governor of the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

July 25. At East Hill, Wandsworth, aged 74, Thomas Prout, esq. Mr. Prout, who was a vendor of patent medicines in the Strand, deserves notice for the cen-

DEATHS.

sistency with which he adhered to his political principles during a long life, and the influence which he exerted in the Westminster elections. With Francis Place and others, who formed a compact band of reformers, he returned Sir Francis Burdett and Sir J. C. Hobhouse; and when those gentlemen saw fit to modify their political views, their supporters remained firm to the principles they had throughout advanced. It must also be added, that though Mr. Prout advocated extreme political changes, his counsels were generally temperate and well-considered.

Oct. 29. At his residence, East-hill, Wandsworth, aged 76, James Pulman, esq., F.S.A., Clarenceux King of Arms and Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod.

May 29. At Surat, from the effects of coup-de-soleil, received while in command of a field force sent against the rebels to Parkur Nuggur, aged 36, Brevet-Major J. E. T. Quale, Thirty-third (Duke of Wellington's) Regiment, Knight of the Legion of Honour.

Dec. 8. At Edinburgh, in his 75th year, Thomas de Quincey, an eminent writer, more popularly known as "the English Opium-eater."

By birth De Quincey was favourably placed in the middle rank. His father, Thomas de Quincey, a merchant, who began life with what has been designated "the dangerous fortune" of 6000*l.*, prospered so well in business that when he died of pulmonary consumption in his thirty-ninth year, he left to his widow and six young children a fortune of 30,000*l.*, and a pleasant seat on the outskirts of Manchester. Alluding to his father's commercial position, which was highly respectable, and of importance enough to entitle him to the benefit of Cicero's condescending distinction between petty and wholesale trade, De Quincey speaks of him in "The Confessions" as "this imperfectly despicable man." The wealth earned by the father's imperfectly despicable practices bestowed a liberal education on the son, who was a remarkably precocious and sensitive child. After receiving instruction from a succession of masters, De Quincey, unable to brook the control of the guardians appointed him under his father's will, and indignant at not being allowed forthwith to enter himself at Oxford, ran away from the Manchester Grammar School with 12*l.* in his pocket, and, after making a brief excursion in Wales, found himself in London,

penniless and without a friend. Though only seventeen years of age he might, without any difficulty, have earned subsistence by his scholarship, for his classical attainments were so great and accurate that his master had more than a year before with pride pointed him out to a stranger, and said:—"That boy could harangue an Athenian mob better than you or I could address an English one." But it never even occurred to him to get bread by work. The only attempts he made to keep off starvation were fruitless ones to raise money on the property to which he would be entitled on coming of age. When his folly had been amply punished by suffering, the wayward lad was restored to his family; and in the Christmas of 1803, being then only eighteen years of age, he matriculated at Oxford. His University career extended over five years. In 1804 he was introduced to Charles Lamb. Coleridge he did not know till 1807, when he made the poet's acquaintance at Bridgewater, in Somersetshire, and contrived to convey to him, through Mr. Cottle's hand, a present of 300*l.* This act of generosity on the part of De Quincey should not be forgotten. It is true that the time came when, reduced in health and circumstances by his pernicious habit of opium-eating, he condescended to accept the charity of others; and it is also true that he had the indelicacy to allude in his writings to the service he conferred on his friend; but his conduct on this occasion was noble, though unwise. The gift was a considerable part of his small patrimony, which had already been much reduced by the expenses of his Oxford life. From 1808 to 1829 De Quincey passed nine out of every twelve months in Westmoreland. He took a lease of Wordsworth's cottage, wedded a gentle and affectionate wife, and amidst the pleasures derived from the Lake scenery, a good library, and his beloved drug, led the life of a scholar, a dreamer, and a voluptuary. From 1804 to 1812 the baneful practice of consuming opium grew upon him by slow degrees; but in 1813 he increased the quantity and frequency of his doses so much that he took 320 grains of opium, or 8000 drops of laudanum daily. Prodigious as this quantity is, it is only half what Coleridge was in the habit of taking. But in both men the indulgence produced the same results,—pecuniary embarrassment, bodily decay, and mental debility. De Quincey had been married five years, and

DEATHS.

had already three children, when, in 1821, he made a strong effort to throw off the indolence which had rendered his youth and early manhood useless, and commenced those literary exertions by which he contributed in no slight degree to the comfort of those dependent on him, and enabled the world to see how much he might have accomplished if laudanum had not enfeebled his powers. He wrote the first portion of "The Confessions" for the *London Magazine* in 1821; and from that time he used his pen with great, but fitful, industry for various publications,—such as *Blackwood's Magazine*, *Tait's*, the *North British Review*, and the "Encyclopædia Britannica." In 1832 he permanently took up his residence in Scotland; and there, in the land of his adoption, he expired, on the morning of Thursday, the 8th of December.

The character of Mr. De Quincey has been viewed in two very distinct lights, even by persons who are agreed on the genius of his writings. A critic who witnessed the waste of noble gifts, with just severity says in *The Athenæum*:—

"There is little that charity would mention or be silent about with regard to Thomas de Quincey's life with which the public are not already familiar. Those of his writings which are of any value or interest contain the story of his friendships and quarrels, the dreams of his youth, the errors of his manhood, and the disappointments of his riper age. In them he held up to public observation his moral infirmities, the pathetic secrets of his home, and the weaknesses of those friends who had cherished him in periods of mental distress and external trouble. As a writer he was an egotist, even more than a mystic. He could never take his pen in his hand without digressing from the subject immediately under consideration to personal feelings and individual experiences. Unfortunately for his reputation and his friends, with a mind so constituted he lived almost entirely in domestic retirement, and, in following the bent of his genius, was guilty of betraying confidences that, as a man of honour, he ought to have held sacred. 'The Confessions,' the 'Suspiria de Profundis,' and his other autobiographic sketches, are at once the materials of his literary fame and the memorials of his life.

"Of all his writings, and all of them are steeped in egotism, 'The Confessions' are the most characteristic. In their elegance of diction, playfulness of style,

subdued pedantry, and utter shamelessness, the entire man is made known to the reader. The assurance with which he holds himself up to inspection as an instance of human misery, and not of guilt, at the very time that he explains with analytical exactness how indulgence in opium had robbed him of the energy to use his talents for his own good or that of others, is a marvellous instance of how a mind may, by a habit of diseased introspection, become so tolerant of its own deformities as to lose all sensitiveness about them. Surely his was the most unhealthy and abnormal mind to be found amongst modern writers. In many respects he resembled Coleridge,—in his love of classic literature and metaphysical inquiry, in the diversity of his intellectual sympathies, and in his habit of minutely dissecting his own emotions; but he lacked the philosophic breadth and genuine Christian goodness of the poet. Coleridge could not reflect without agonies of remorse on the moral infirmities which De Quincey, with as much flippancy as wit, wrote of as a condition bordering on jest."

On the other hand a writer whom personal intercourse with the departed had given a closer view of the amenities of his daily life, and who, appreciating the nobler and more ethereal parts of his personal gifts, was content to overlook the fact that those high mental endowments had been exerted to no useful end, says of his latter days—

"It is only the other day that a volume of Mr. De Quincey's collected works appeared with his own corrections and notes, and, till close on the hour when it passed beyond our horizon, his pure and high intellect shone serene and clear as when in its zenith. Almost till the very last his perceptions were as vivid, his interest in knowledge and affairs as keen as ever; and while his bodily frame, wasted by suffering and thought, day by day faded and shrank, his mind retained unimpaired its characteristic capaciousness, activity, and acuteness. Within a week or two he talked readily, and with all that delicacy of discrimination of which his conversation partook equally with his writings, of such matters as occupied the attention of our citizens or of our countrymen; displaying so much of elasticity and power that even those who had the rare privilege and opportunity of seeing him in those latter days cannot be otherwise than

DEATHS.

startled and shocked by the seeming suddenness of his death. Yet he was full of years, having considerably passed the term of threescore and ten, and in him, if ever in any man, the sword may be said to have worn out its scabbard. Not only the continual exercise of the brain, but the extreme sensibility of his emotional nature, had so taxed and wasted his never athletic physical frame, that the wonder lay rather in his life having been so prolonged. Full of years, he has also died full of honours such as he cared to win, leaving behind him the name not only of a profound scholar in the department he affected, but one of the greatest masters of English pure and undefiled who ever handled the pen. He is the absolute creator of a species of 'impassioned prose' which he seemed born to introduce, and in which he had no prototype, no rival, no successor. In the free exercise of his rare and peculiar genius, he swept with eagle plume through spheres far too ethereal to sustain a common flight; yet he soared not vaguely, but as bearing with serene and steady eye towards the light of truth. Nor while familiar with all the mysteries of 'cloud-land, gorgeous land,' was he less a denizen of our common earth, or less keenly alive to the influence of 'its smiles and tears.' Indeed, as he admits in his famous 'Confessions,' Mr. De Quincey was only too susceptible to every touch of human sympathy, being endowed with such exquisite sensibility as thrilled with too ready and deep response to every note of

'The still, sad music of humanity.' This overwrought sensitiveness it seemed to be that caused him to withdraw almost entirely from the society of even his most esteemed friends, to shut himself up with his books and manuscripts, and to remit his seclusion only at rare intervals."

During the decline of life, Mr. De Quincey resided in that charming cottage at Lasswade where Sir Walter Scott passed the first and perhaps the happiest portion of his married life; but the concluding months of his existence were spent in Edinburgh, in order that he might more conveniently superintend the passage through the press of a collected edition of his works, which has been since completed.

Mr. De Quincey has left five children, three daughters and two sons.

Aug. 27. At 27, Burton-st., Berkeley-sq., London, William St. Quintin, esq.,

of Scampston-hall and Lowthorpe-lodge, Yorkshire, High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1842.

Mr. St. Quintin was a collateral descendant of one of the most ancient families in the kingdom. Their direct ancestor was one of the companions of William the Conqueror, from whom he received vast grants of land and manors in Yorkshire. On one of these, Harpham, his descendants lived in baronial splendour through all the vicissitudes of wars and revolutions, and contributed eminent men to the service of the Plantagenets, the Tudors, the Stuarts, and the Brunswicks. In 1642 a baronetcy was conferred on William St. Quintin, of Harpham, by Charles I. It became extinct in 1795. The last baronet was succeeded in his estates by his nephew, William Thomas Darby, of Sunbury, who thereon assumed the name of St. Quintin. The deceased gentleman was his son. He married, in 1842, Sarah Louisa, daughter of Andrew Bennett, esq., but having no issue he is succeeded by his brother. He is buried in Harpham Church with eight centuries of his ancestry.

Aug. At a very advanced age, Lieut.-Col. Edward Raitt, K.C. This gallant officer was one of the few survivors of the wars of the eighteenth century, his first commission being dated in 1796. Col. Raitt first saw active service in the Irish Rebellion, having been present at the taking of Wexford by Sir John Moore. He next served under Sir Ralph Abercromby, was with General Maitland in the secret expedition to Quiberon Bay, was present at the siege and taking of Aboukir Fort, and at all the military movements in Egypt down to the blockade and surrender of Alexandria, when he was created Knight of the Crescent, and received a gold medal from the Sultan for his services. In 1808 he went to Portugal under General Acland, was present at the battle of Vimiera and at the occupation of Lisbon, marched with Sir John Hope to Salamanca, joined the army assembled under Sir John Moore, and accompanied it in all its operations to the battle of Corunna, at which he greatly distinguished himself. He accompanied the expedition to Walcheren, under the Earl of Chatham, and was present at the siege and capture of Flushing. He was aide-de-camp to General Houston in Portugal in 1811, and was at the battle of Fuentes d'Oñer. In 1812 he was appointed Assistant-Adjutant-General of

DEATHS.

the north-west and central inland districts, under Sir Thomas Maitland, was on the staff at Portsmouth as Assistant-Quartermaster-General in 1814, and was on duty there at the visit of the Prince Regent and the other Sovereigns and distinguished men of Europe. In 1816 he was appointed Deputy Adjutant-General to the forces in the Mediterranean, in which service he continued till his retirement in 1829, since which time he has served as barrack master in various garrisons. He received the Peninsular medal and four clasps.

Oct. 7. At her son-in-law's, Thorn Faulcon, Somerset, aged 82, Lady Ramsay, second daughter of Duncan Macdonell, of Glengary, relict of William Chisholm, of Chisholm, and Sir T. Ramsay, bart.

July 28. Suddenly, at Kirkee, Bombay, the Ven. Francis Cocks Puget Reynolds, B.A., 1837, St. John's College, Cambridge, Archdeacon of Bombay, and chaplain of Kirkee.

April 14. At his residence, Halinggrove, near Croydon, aged 36, Walter Ricardo, esq.

Jan. 23. Aged 81, Stephen Richards, esq., of Tavistock-sq., late one of the Masters in Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer.

Oct. 30. At the Rectory, Puttenham, Surrey, aged 67, the Rev. Thomas Walkin Richards, fourth son of the late Chief Baron of the Exchequer.

July 10. At his house, Thurcaston, aged 48, Charles George, eldest surviving son of the late Sir John Richardson, formerly one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas.

May 8. At the Elms, Cheltenham, aged 78, the Dowager Lady Ricketts, widow of Adm. Sir Robert T. Ricketts, bart.

Aug. 27. At his residence, Tudor-lodge, Cheltenham, aged 55, the Rev. J. E. Biddle, Incumbent of St. Philip and St. James, Leckhampton, Gloucestershire; Bampton Lecturer in 1852, and author, among numerous other works, of an esteemed "Latin-English and English-Latin Dictionary."

Jan. 28. At Putney Heath, aged 76, the Right Hon. John Earl of Ripon, Viscount Goderich, of Nocton, P.C., F.R.S., a Governor of the Charterhouse, and late Recorder of Lincoln. It may be necessary, says a journalist in announcing the death of this venerable peer, to remind our readers that the name of this statesman will be found in the list of our Prime Ministers, and that he is singular among

Prime Ministers in being the only one who never faced Parliament in that capacity, his Cabinet having been formed so weakly or managed so clumsily that it fell to pieces before the accustomed time of trial arrived. We would speak of him kindly, for he always meant well and was always liberal in his leanings; but it is impossible to slur over the fact that as a statesman he was, perhaps, the weakest Premier to whom a Sovereign of England ever intrusted the seals of office. He was not quick; he was wanting in decision; he saw the end long before he saw the means; and his too sanguine hopes and self-complacent disposition often led him into difficulties from which there was no escape without ridicule. He is perhaps the most nicknamed of all our statesmen. For his delinquencies as a Chancellor of the Exchequer he was nicknamed by Cobbett "Prosperity Robinson;" for his want of vigour as a Colonial Secretary he received from Sir Charles Napier the name of "Goody Goderich." Yet the fact of his holding a very responsible position in at least half-a-dozen Administrations shows that, however little he excited the enthusiasm of the public, he inspired the respect and confidence of his personal friends who had the distribution of these posts in their hands. Unless it be Lord Palmerston, it would be difficult to name a surviving statesman who was longer in office than the late Lord Ripon. He is the last of that race of Cabinet Ministers who ruled England in the dreary period between the conclusion of the war and the first Reform Bill, and whom Mr. Disraeli has satirized as a cluster of mediocrities, headed by an arch-mediocrity.

The Earl of Ripon was born in London in the year 1782, the second son of Lord Grantham by a daughter of Lord Hardwicke, whose mother was co-heiress of the De Greys, Dukes of Kent. His lordship was therefore half-brother to Earl de Grey, who died in November of the present year. The Earl was educated at Harrow, where he was the contemporary of Peel, Aberdeen, Palmerston, and Lord Byron. From Harrow he went to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he obtained Sir William Browne's Medal for the best Latin ode. Scarcely had he left college when he became private secretary to his relative, Lord Hardwicke, who was then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland,—a post which he continued to fill until the death

DEATHS.

of Pitt drove the Tories from office, and cleared the way for the coalition of "all the talents." On the return of the Tories to place, Mr. Robinson, who had obtained a seat in Parliament, first for Carlow, then for Ripon, was again engaged in the public service, rapidly rose, and passing from one sphere of duty to another, but always to a higher, must have given some evidence of versatile talent or plodding ability. He accompanied Lord Pembroke's mission to Vienna in 1807. In 1809, being then member for Ripon, he was intrusted by the Duke of Portland's Administration with the duty of moving the Address. In the spring of the same year he became Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in Perceval's Administration. From the Colonial-office—which was then also the War-office—Mr. Robinson retired with Lord Castlereagh, when that statesman withdrew from the Government on his quarrel and duel with Mr. Canning; but, in the following year, his near relative becoming First Lord of the Admiralty, offered him a seat at the Board, and he remained a Lord until, in 1812, the Premiership devolved on Lord Liverpool in consequence of the assassination of Mr. Perceval. Under the auspices of the new chief he entered upon the Vice-Presidency of the Board of Trade, enjoying along with this office the emoluments at first of a Lordship of the Treasury, and subsequently of Paymaster of the Forces. He was then made a Privy Councillor. At the end of a few years he became President of the Board of Trade, and from the Board of Trade rose to the Ministry of Finance. He was four years Chancellor of the Exchequer, and then returned once more to the Colonial-office, but now as Secretary of State. A few months later he became First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister. In succeeding Administrations now at the head of the Colonial Office, now of the Board of Trade, at one time Lord Privy Seal, and at another time President of the Board of Control, he went the round of all the public departments. He was everything by turns—the most accommodating Minister we ever heard of, ready to turn his hand at a moment's warning to any kind of work, ready without hesitation to accept any amount of responsibility. Decidedly a useful character—a level, humdrum, hardworking Minister, not a great statesman, but an out-and-out man of office—not a thoroughbred winner of the

race, not a fiery stamper of the soil, but an easy-going cob, accustomed to single or double harness, quiet under the saddle, and having no objection to the plough, the harrow, or the mill.

It was on his elevation to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer in 1823 that the British public for the first time were enabled to take the measure of Mr. Frederick Robinson's abilities. He belonged to a knot of men of whom great things were expected. Canning, Huskisson, and Robinson represented the Liberal section of Lord Liverpool's Cabinet; a very large party in the nation regarded them with extraordinary sympathy, and looked to them for the salvation of the country from the oppression of taxation, from the incubus of antiquated restrictions, from the terrors of a tyrannical code, from the demon of sedition, and from the sin of participating in the grinding policy of the continental monarchies—these were to be the mighty statesmen of the future, these the lights of England and the world. Never were bright hopes more rudely dashed in pieces. The physical strength of one gave way just as he had grasped the rod of empire and was about to lift it; the second was run down by the first railway train, and disappeared almost before he was well known; the third lived to these days, and people are asking—"Who was Lord Ripon? What did he do?" In one way or another all disappointed the public expectation, but none more than Frederick Robinson, who year by year came to Parliament with his most complacent smiles and his most delightful budgets at a time when the nation was sinking under the severest commercial distress. Despite, however, of his blunders as a financier, the Chancellor of the Exchequer by no means lost the confidence of his friends, and he was considered an immense improvement on his predecessor in office, Mr. Vansittart, who had been raised to the peerage under the title of Lord Bexley, in order to make room for the personation of Prosperity. Mr. Robinson was able to go through a budget speech with something of perspicuity; Mr. Vansittart always bungled it. He, in fact, became more and more trusted, till at length, on the premature death of Canning, of whose Administration he was the Colonial Minister, with a peerage as Viscount Goderich, he was offered the premiership that was to keep the Canning

DEATHS.

Ministry together. He at once accepted the offer; but, through internal dissension, which it is needless to recapitulate, the Cabinet over which he presided gave way before it had the opportunity of meeting Parliament, and when he had been at the head of it but three months. From that moment Lord Goderich ceased to be a star in the political firmament. His name, indeed, was found in succeeding Ministries, but it was of small public account. He did his work and made his speech, but it was not of much national moment what he said or did.

Lord Goderich was Colonial Secretary in Earl Grey's Ministry of 1830, and became Lord Privy Seal in 1833, receiving at the same time an Earldom, taking his title from Ripon, the borough which had faithfully returned him to Parliament for twenty years. In 1834, with Lord Stanley, Sir J. Graham, and the Duke of Richmond, he withdrew from the Cabinet, alarmed at the ultra-liberal propositions of the Reform Administration in regard to the Irish Church. The Earl did not hold office in Sir R. Peel's Government of 1834-5; but in that of 1841 he was first President of the Board of Trade, and then of the Board of Control. On the break-up of Sir R. Peel's Government in 1846, the Earl retired from official life; but in 1846 he presented a singular example of the vicissitudes which public and private opinions may undergo in the period of a single generation. In 1815 it was the duty of Mr. Frederick Robinson to introduce the celebrated Corn Law Bill in the House of Commons: in 1846 he, then Earl of Ripon, voluntarily moved, in the House of Lords, the second reading of that Bill which was to effect the abolition of the Corn Laws. The experience of thirty years had stultified the convictions of the wisest men of that day, and confounded alike the prophecies and the prophets.

The Earl of Ripon married, in 1814, Lady Sarah Hobart, only daughter and eventually sole heiress of the last Earl of Buckinghamshire, by whom he has left issue an only child, the present Earl de Grey and Ripon, Under-Secretary of State for War.

April 22. Suddenly, at a railway station near Birmingham, Mr. E. V. Ripplingill, an artist of considerable excellence. His best known works are an admirable series illustrating "The Progress of Drunkenness," now at the Liverpool Institute; "The Country Post-

Office." One of his pictures is among the Vernon Collection.

April 13. Accidentally killed in King William-st., City, aged 32, David Ritchie, esq., of Kingswood-terr., Lee, Kent, Secretary to the Committee of Treasury of the Bank of England.

Aug. 20. At Hampstead, Captain John Robb, Naval Aide-de-Camp to Her Majesty. The deceased officer had seen much active service. In 1827 he commanded a tender at the battle of Navarino. In consideration of his distinguished services in that memorable action, he was raised to the rank of Commander in 1829. He was promoted to post rank in 1841, and commanded the *Gladiator* frigate for three years; and afterwards the *Cæsar*, 90, in the Baltic, throughout the Russian war.

March 21. At her residence, 6, Merriam-sq., East, Dublin, Emily Dowager Baroness de Robeck.

Feb. 31. At Beauchamp-lodge, Leamington, aged 73, Lieut.-General Henry Tufnell Roberts, C.B.

Dec. 2. At Kingston-on-Thames, aged 83, William Roots, esq., M.D.

Sept. 17. At Wortham, aged 100, Mr. John Roper, farmer. He retained the use of his faculties till within a few days of his death.

Nov. 27. Drowned by the upsetting of a boat, Colonel Rose, of the Royal Engineers. He was the godson of the poet Cowper, and was a man of literary tastes himself. He had served 44 years in the army, and was long stationed on the Cape frontier, many curious particulars respecting which he had published in an interesting work styled "Four Years' Residence in Southern Africa."

Jan. 2. At Edinburgh, aged 23, the Right Hon. George William Evelyn Leslie, Earl of Rothes. His lordship dying unmarried, the title and estates devolve on his only sister, Lady Henrietta, who is now Countess of Rothes in her own right.

May 17. At Frankfort-on-the-Maine, aged 51, Baroness Anselme de Rothschild, eldest dau. of the late N. M. Rothschild.

Nov. 9. After a short illness, at Point de Galle, where he was holding the Sessions of the Supreme Court, aged 58, Sir William Carpenter Rowe, knt., Chief Justice of the Island of Ceylon.

Oct. 20. At Clifton, aged 81, Daniel Rowland, esq., of 28, Grosvenor-place, London, formerly of Saxonbury-lodge,

DEATHS.

Frant, Sussex, Justice of the Peace for the counties of Kent and Sussex, and a Deputy-Lieutenant for Sussex, for which county he also, in 1824, served the office of High Sheriff.

In 1830 Mr. Rowland printed for private circulation "An Historical and Genealogical Account of the Noble Family of Nevill," in one vol. large folio, a work in which is brought together a large amount of valuable information, collected chiefly from unpublished manuscripts and private papers, bearing upon the history of our country during the Middle Ages, as connected with that of one of our most powerful families.

May 16. At Ashiesteel, Selkirkshire, Gen. Sir James Russell, K.C.B. He was born at Madras in 1781, entered the military service of the East India Company in 1795, and was engaged in the principal military affairs of the East Indies from 1799 to 1825. He greatly distinguished himself at the battle of Mahedpoor, where he commanded a brigade of cavalry.

March 24. Killed by a fall from his horse while hunting with the Limerick harriers, aged 45, Michael Patrick Russell, esq., J.P., of Glenmore, co. Cork.

Aug. 1. At Grove-end-road, St. John's Wood, aged 36, the well-known writer Mr. Bayle St. John, second son of Mr. James Augustus St. John, author of "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Greeks," the "Nemesis of Power," &c. He was engaged in literature before he was well out of his teens, having written some humorous papers in *Fraser*, "De Re Vehiculari," at the age of 20, and had acquired no inconsiderable reputation as an author. In 1846 he travelled through France and Italy on his way to Egypt, and published a work on the Libyan desert. He resided for a considerable period (after a second visit to Egypt) in France. His works, "The Subalpine Kingdom," "The Turks in Europe," "Travels of an Arab Merchant," "Hungarian Emigration in Turkey," "Purple Tints of Paris," "The Levantine Family," and "Maretimo," were characterized by shrewdness, animation, and vigour of style, and were deservedly popular. His work on Montaigne was both the last and the best of his productions, showing depth of thought and an evident power of philosophical analysis.

Sept. 25. At Meaford, Staffordshire, aged 92, the Viscount St. Vincent, one of the three senior members of the House

of Peers. The deceased Peer, Edward Jervis Jervis Viscount St. Vincent, of Meaford, co. Stafford, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, was second son of Mr. William Henry Ricketts and Mary, fourth dau. of Mr. Swynfen Jervis, and sister of the gallant Admiral Earl St. Vincent, first Viscount. The late Peer was twice married; first, 29th January, 1790, to the Hon. Mary Cassandra Twisleton, second dau. of Thomas, tenth Lord Saye and Sele, which marriage was dissolved in 1798, when the deceased Viscount married, secondly, Mary Anne, second dau. of the late Mr. Thomas Parker. He succeeded to the viscounty and estates on the death of his uncle, Admiral the Earl St. Vincent, in March, 1823.

Nov. 26. At Paris, in her 86th year, the Princess Anna Sapieha, mother-in-law of Prince Adam Czartoryski.

The deceased, who belonged to the most illustrious families of Poland, was born in 1772. Her father, Count Andrew Zamoyiski, Grand Chancellor of the Crown of Poland, enjoyed the reputation of being the most noble and upright character of the reign of Stanislaus Augustus. The wife of the Chancellor, the mother of the deceased Princess, was a daughter of Prince Joseph Czartoryski, of the Korzee branch. The great economy practised by this lady in all the details of her private life formed a striking contrast to the luxury then universally prevalent in Warsaw; but when Kosciuszko raised aloft the standard of insurrection, this parsimonious but also truly patriotic woman opened her rich treasury, and silently poured its contents into the national exchequer. Such were the family traditions amid which Princess Anna Sapieha's character was formed. She inherited from her father true patriotism and the virile virtues of the citizen, and from her mother the love of order and the art of making a noble use of her fortune.

In 1794 the Princess married, at Zamosc, Prince Alexander Sapieha, who was born at Strasburg, where, driven by the misfortunes of Poland, his father had sought refuge. In consequence of the hope of the assistance of France having been held out to his country, Prince Sapieha entered the service of Napoleon I., but his life was terminated prematurely in 1812. Two children—the Princess Anna, afterwards married to Prince Adam Czartoryski, and Prince Leon Sapieha—were the issue of this

DEATHS.

marriage. At the death of her husband the Princess, though still comparatively young, and accustomed to live in the great world of Paris and Warsaw, did not for a moment hesitate between the serious and sacred duties of a mother and the frivolous pleasures of the world, but devoted herself exclusively to the education of her children and to the administration of her fortune, which had suffered considerably in consequence of the disasters which had befallen her country. The duties to which she devoted herself with unflinching constancy fortified her soul, and endowed her with rare sagacity in the management of affairs, without in any way quenching that enthusiasm of the heart which enabled her, when circumstances required it, to rise above the minute calculations of prudence. During the campaign in Prussia she was seen in Paris kneeling at the feet of Kosciuszko, imploring him to join the army of Napoleon I.

After the disasters of Poland in 1831 Princess Sapieha remained in the country, and by her efforts succeeded in saving some remnants of the colossal fortune of Prince Czartoryski; and having joined his family in 1836, she brought with her an accession to their pecuniary means, but never ceased to preach order and economy, without, however, closing her heart against the wants of her countrymen or of her country. In Paris she became, indeed, as it were, the cashier of all the charitable and useful institutions connected with the Polish emigration, and whenever a public or a private want was felt Princess Sapieha was sure to be applied to. Despising luxury and pomp, loving all that was good and beautiful, always at work, always surrounded by accounts, by lists, and by petitions, she knew how to refuse, and she delighted in granting, favours; and she continues even beyond the tomb her public benefactions, having bequeathed a large sum to her children to be employed solely for public purposes.

Nov. 14. At Cheltenham, aged 60, Capt. Durell De Sausmarez, Royal Navy.

Jan. 8. At the Lawn, Taunton, aged 97, James Du Sautoy, esq. He was the son of Pierre François Du Sautoy, a French cavalry officer, one of the seven French officers who accompanied Prince Charles Edward in his romantic attempt to recover his father's crown in 1745. His family claimed a connection with the Stuarts through the House of Guise. The

gentleman now deceased had served in the army.

Oct. 29. At Nemours, in Algeria, of cholera, aged 21, Frederick, son of the Rev. Frederick Du Sautoy, of Haselbury.

May 14. Thomas Savage, esq., of Midsomer Norton, a magistrate and deputy-lieut. for Somersetshire.

June 19. At Curzon-st., May-fair, aged 59, Lydia, Lady Scott, widow of Sir Edward Dolman Scott, bart., of Great Barr, Staffordshire.

Jan. 18. At his residence, Stratton-st., Piccadilly, aged 61, Dr. John Scott, M.D., F.R.C.P., Examining Physician to the Secretary of State for India in Council.

April 10. At Dartmouth, aged 90, Mrs. Scudamore, relict of the late George A. Scudamore, esq. This venerable lady was related by marriage to two ancient ducal families, those of Norfolk and Beaufort; and among the reminiscences of her remote childhood was a vivid recollection of the poet Cowper, and his friends, Mrs. Unwin and Lady Hesketh, all of whom she had personally known.

June 27. In Wilton-crescent, of diphtheria, aged 44, Lady Sebright.

March 24. At Twizel House, Northumberland, Lewis Tabitha, wife of Pridesaux John Selby, esq., and sister of the late Bertram Mitford, esq., of Mitford Castle.

Aug. 16. In Paris, aged 54, Lord Henry Seymour, brother of the Marquis of Hertford, who was some years back so well known in Paris for his successes on the French turf. He was the only brother and heir-presumptive of the present Marquis of Hertford. He filled a large space in the eye of Paris society, and has been the cynosure of the French sporting world since the days of Charles X. He was the founder of the Paris Jockey Club, and has died enormously rich. After the funeral, which took place at Père la Chaise, in his mother's vault, only attended by Lord Hertford, Vicomte Daru, and five members of the Jockey Club, his will was opened, and the hospitals of Paris were found to have inherited a rent-roll equal to 36,000*l.* sterling per annum. As all this property came through his mother, the late marchioness, England has no claim on it; indeed, the testator, born in Paris, never set foot on British soil in his life. Four favourite horses enjoy an annuity and exemption from saddle-work. Other annuities are named. The large edifice on the Boulevards, late Café de Paris, so long the head-quarters

DEATHS.

of gastronomy, will still supply broths and restoratives to another class of Parisians, on which its rental now devolves.

April 3. On board the *Nemesis* steamship, on his return to England, aged 38, Lieut.-Col. Seymour, of H.M.'s Eighty-fourth Regiment.

Dec. 4. At his residence, 62, Gloucester-pl., Portman-sq., aged 82, Henry Shank, esq., of Castlerig and Gleniston, in the county of Fife, for twenty-five years a Director of the Hon. East India Company.

Sept. 17. At his residence, Grove Lodge, Upper Sydenham, aged 66, John Sharland, esq., Deputy Chairman of the North Devon Railway.

Dec. 27. Aged 90, the Rev. John Sharpe, Rector of Castle Eaton. Endued with sound learning, a high critical faculty in classic and mediæval lore, he, after publishing an admirable translation of "William of Malmesbury" jointly with Mr. Petrie, the Keeper of the Records at the Tower of London, prepared the materials for that valuable compilation, the "Monumenta Historica Britannica." Those who have occasion to elucidate the history of the kingdom before the Norman Conquest will all readily bear witness to the correctness and worth of this work, which is being pursued, under a different system, in the collections for the uses of British History sanctioned at the present time by the Treasury and the Master of the Rolls.

Aug. 1. At Christ's College, Cambridge, aged 73, the Rev. Joseph Shaw, B.D., Senior Fellow of Christ's College. In 1849, being then senior fellow of his college, he was, on the elevation of Dr. Graham to the see of Chester, elected to succeed the right rev. prelate in the mastership, but resigned the office before his term of grace had expired, in the conscientious feeling that his age rendered him unsuited to bear the responsibilities of the office.

Jan. 12. In Mansfield-st., John Shepherd, esq., Member of the Council of India, formerly Deputy Master of the Trinity House.

March 18. At Coombe-park, Hamsey, Sussex, aged 68, Sir Henry Shiffner, the second bart., a retired Vice-Admiral.

Sir Henry was the second son of Sir George Shiffner, to whose titles and estates he succeeded in 1842; his elder brother, a captain in the Third Foot Guards, having been killed at the sortie from Bayonne in 1815. Admiral Shiffner, in his youth, saw a great deal of active

and hard service during the war, at the close of which he returned as commander of the *Hastings*. He was subsequently made a Rear-Admiral, retired, ultimately becoming Vice-Admiral.

April 30. At West-hill, near Fareham, aged 73, Eliza, daughter of Arthur Stanhope, esq., and widow of Evelyn John Shirley, esq., of Lower Eatington Park, Warwickshire, and Lough Fea, county Monaghan.

Sept. 1. At Southampton, Lieut.-Col. C. W. Sibley, of the Sixty-fourth (the second Staffordshire) Regt. This gallant officer served in the Thirteenth Regt.; he took part in the first Burmese war, for which he had a medal; and while in the Sixty-second he served in the campaign on the Sutlej, and was severely wounded at the battle of Ferozeshah.

June 7. At Coombe-wood, aged 46, William Sim, esq., of King's Bench-walk, Temple, second son of John Sim, esq., of Coombe-wood, Kingston, Surrey.

Sept. 3. At Foxhill-bank, Lancashire, aged 46, James Simpson, esq. The deceased was president of the Vegetarian Society.

Aug. 28. At Haslar Hospital, aged 39, John Simpson, esq., surgeon, R.N. This gentleman was one of our Arctic heroes, having served five years in the Arctic expedition in search of Sir John Franklin in the *Plover*, commanded by Lieut. R. Maguire.

June 1. At Chesham-pl., Capt. Archibald Sinclair, R.N., fourth son of the late Right Hon. Sir John Sinclair, bart.

Dec. 2. At Pepper-park, near Reading, John Sivewright, esq., Deputy-Lieut. and Magistrate for the counties of Berks and Oxon.

Dec. 21. At his residence, Moorton House, Market-Rasen, aged 72, George Skipworth, esq. The deceased was a Magistrate and Deputy-Lieut. for Lincolnshire, and had filled the office of High Sheriff of that county.

Aug. 13. At Monty's Court, in his 98th year, General Sir John Slade, bart., G.C.H., colonel of the Fifth Dragoons. Sir John entered the army in 1780, and, with the exception of General McKenzie, whose first commission is dated in 1778, was the oldest member of the army. This service of eighty years was illustrated by many brave actions. In 1809, just fifty years ago, Sir John Slade became a Major-General, and commanded a brigade of cavalry in the Peninsula in that year, under Sir John Moore. In the

DEATHS.

subsequent Peninsular campaigns, under the Duke of Wellington, he retained his command, covering the retreat to Torres Vedras, and sharing in many cavalry affairs, as well as in the battles of Fuentes d'Onor, Sahagun, Benevente, and Busaco, for which, and for Corunna, he had the gold war-medal with one clasp, and the silver medal with two clasps, and was twice honoured with the thanks of Parliament for his services. He became colonel of the Fifth Dragoon Guards in 1831, and was created a baronet in the same year.

Dec. 9. Aged 75, of cancer in the tongue, Mr. John Slater, of Greyhound-st., Nottingham. Mr. Slater enlisted in the army in 1803, and fought in most of the battles in the Two Sicilies, in Portugal, in Spain, in the South of France, and at Waterloo. In 1848, when the medal was conferred on the Peninsular heroes, Mr. Slater made his claim for one with fourteen bars, which was one more than his illustrious chief, the Duke of Wellington, obtained: as it was, he satisfied the authorities he was entitled to twelve bars, being only one less than the great commander.

March 26. Frances, wife of Edward Slaughter, esq., of Mansfield-st., Cavendish-sq., and second daughter of the late Sir Edward Mostyn, bart., of Talacre, Flintshire.

June 26. In Harley-st., three days after her confinement, the Marchioness of Sligo; daughter of Mr. Anthony Nugent, of Pallace, co. Galway; married to the Marquis only last summer.

Feb. 23. At Grove Lodge, Regent's-park, aged 67, Francis Smedley, esq., High Bailiff of Westminster.

Feb. 23. At Woodhall Park, aged 71, Abel Smith, esq., senior partner in the eminent banking firm of Smith, Payne, and Smith.

During the last half century the name of Abel Smith has been intimately associated with the banking business of London, and under his able management the house which his grandfather, in connection with the late Mr. Payne, founded, attained to a position second to no private bank in the kingdom. Mr. Smith may almost be said to have been born a banker, his family having for many years previously carried on a flourishing provincial bank at Nottingham, and subsequently they opened a second at Lincoln, a third at Hull, and a fourth at Derby, all of which are carried on with success. It

VOL. CI.

was about the commencement of the present century that the London house was established, the Arkwrights and the Wilberforces, who had long been amongst their best customers in their provincial business, lending all their influence in support of the then-infant house in Lombard-street. But important and lucrative as was the class of customers by whom the house of Smith, Payne, and Smith was backed, and under whose auspices it was launched, it is to the wise and prudent management of its partners, and of the now-deceased gentleman especially, that it is indebted for the prosperity it has achieved. The bank had taken a high position among similar establishments, when the success with which it weathered the great storm of 1825 confirmed the sagacity of its managers. From that time the house of Smith, Payne, and Smith, has ranked as a first-class bank, commanding a business which is limited only by the steady determination of its managers to accept no accounts of a doubtful character, nor to enter into any transactions which can be open to question even in the remotest degree, and which has realized for its principals an aggregate of profit which, if not unexampled, has certainly scarcely ever been surpassed in the annals of London banking. The head of such a firm would naturally carry immense weight as a financier, and though less prominently influential than a Jones Loyd, or a Rothschild, his opinion was sought for not only in the city, but in the House of Commons, where he sat before the Reform Bill as the representative (first) of the borough of Midhurst, afterwards of the borough of Wendover, and, subsequently to 1835, for the county of Herts, which he represented down to the close of his political life in 1847. His views upon all questions of finance were regarded with respect and attention. Mr. Abel Smith adhered to the Conservative politics of his family, which had already raised one of its members to the peerage as Lord Carrington; and he was himself offered the same dignity by Sir Robert Peel. The offer was, however, declined, Mr. Smith preferring that so much of the evening of his life as he could spare from the general supervision which he continued to give to the affairs of the bank, should be devoted to the pursuits of a country gentleman and a resident landlord, aiding and benefiting by his personal presence and oversight those

II

DEATHS.

who were within the immediate sphere of his influence, rather than to occupations for which he possessed no natural taste, and in which he felt that he could no longer render efficient service. His widespread charities, and his liberal contributions for the welfare of the population of his adopted county, are far too numerous to recount. He restored the parish churches of Watton and Seacombe, at a cost in the one instance, of 5000*l.*, and in the other of 3000*l.*. He built a new chapel in the hamlet of Waterford, and another still more recently, with commodious schools attached, in the hamlet of Tonwell. Towards the erection of a new church at Bengoe he contributed upwards of 2000*l.*; and to his exertions and his liberality is the Vicar of that parish indebted for his glebe-lands and his parsonage. Finding the living poorly endowed, he purchased at his own cost (9000*l.*) the lay rectorial tithes, and annexed them in perpetuity to the vicarage. He also, at his own individual expense, restored the parish church of Braintfield, and rebuilt the parsonage-house. The establishment of the Herts Reformatory Institute is largely indebted to him, and there is scarcely a public charity in the county that is not largely indebted to his bounty. The extent of his private charities is, as it ought to be, unknown; but those who may by chance wander through the pleasant woodlands of Watton, will meet with few amongst the poor agricultural population of that district who have not a word of grateful remembrance for substantial benefits received from the squire of Woodhall Park. Mr. Smith was twice married: in 1822, to Lady Henrietta Leslie Melville, daughter of the tenth Earl of Leven and Melville; and secondly, in 1826, to Frances Anne, youngest daughter of the late Gen. Sir Henry Calvert, bart., G.C.B.

The personal property of the deceased banker has been sworn under 400,000*l.*; but his real estates were spread over a wide district—Hertfordshire, Middlesex, London, Lincolnshire, Derby, Stafford, and Leicester, and produced a very large revenue.

Nov. 11. At Lower Belgrave-pl., Pimlico, aged 67, Lieut-Col. Joseph Smith, late H.M.'s Fourteenth Regt.

May 16. At Leybourne Rectory, Kent, aged 65, Sir Michael Cusac Smith, bart.

March 26. At his residence, Wingfield House, near Bradford-on-Avon, aged 71, Joseph Grace Smith, esq., Judge of the

County Courts of Bath and North Wiltshire.

May 19. At Compton Bassett House, the residence of G. H. Walker Heneage, esq.; Mrs. Assheton Smith, widow of Thos. Assheton Smith, esq., of Tedworth House, "*le premier chasseur d'Angleterre.*"

April 28. At Bath, aged 47, Anne, widow of Harry Smyth, Lieut-Col. in the Sixty-eighth Regt. Light Infantry, killed at Inkermann, and daughter of the late Hon. and Right Rev. Edmond Knox, Bishop of Limerick.

March 17. At Petworth, aged 81, the Rev. Thomas Sockett, Exeter College, Oxford, Rector of Duncton and of Petworth, Sussex, and of North Searle, Lincolnshire. The most noteworthy circumstance in the life of this excellent man was, that, in early youth, he had been the amanuensis of the poet Hayley.

April 25. At Edinburgh, Maj.-Gen. Andrew Spens, of the Bengal Army.

Oct. 22. At Cassel, aged 75, Dr. Louis Spohr, one of the greatest composers of this age.

Dr. Spohr was born at Brunswick in 1784. His father, who was a respectable physician, early perceived his son's taste for music, and caused him to be so well instructed, that, at a very early age, he had attained considerable professional reputation as a violinist. About 1804-5 he was appointed chapel-master at Gotha; and about the same time married a lady who was reputed the best harpist in Germany. Being on a musical tour with his wife he was induced to accept the musical direction of the theatre *An der Wien* at Vienna, for which he wrote his finest dramatic works. About 1823 he became chapel-master to the Electoral Court of Hesse-Cassel, which office he retained until age compelled his retirement.

Dr. Spohr was a most consummate master of the violin, whether considered as an executant or a composer of music adapted to its peculiar powers. His playing, as described by those who were familiar with it in its golden age, was unimpeachable, dignified, graceful, pure, if less expressive than modern taste requires, and, if cold, so admirably measured as to convert coldness itself into an impressing power. His eminence as a composer of violin music is attested by the numerous solos, concertos, and chamber-pieces which he produced, and which are held among the choicest works of that

DEATHS.

kind of composition in every country. Dr. Spohr must also be considered as the great master of the modern school of German violinists. His method, in its simplicity, in its absence of anything crude, impure, or tricky, made him a first-class professor. What Hummel was on the piano-forte Dr. Spohr was on the violin—the best master of the best classical school.

Among Spohr's dramatic music the operas of "Faust," "Jessonda," "Zemire and Azor," hold the first place; and, with four or five other works intended for the stage, keep their place among great dramatical compositions. His symphonies, overtures, and cantatas, and three oratorios, hold a very high place in the estimation of scientific musicians. Some half a century since, Dr. Spohr's compositions excited the greatest enthusiasm; but this has to a considerable extent died away, and among a vast mass of works, few keep their favour in their entirety, though particular fragments occupy prominent places in all selections of music of a classical character. The reason is very obvious:—scientific and sound as his music is universally admitted to be, the amount of melody in it is singularly small; and, therefore, while its technical excellence commends itself to all persons of large musical acquirements, there is little that wins upon the popular favour. For the same reason, of all Spohr's numerous songs and airs, whether included in his operas, or published separately, very few are known, and not one popular. Among composers, Spohr, confessedly great, is perhaps the only one who has experienced the peculiar infelicity of never having been adapted to a street organ.

Aug. 3. At Upper Norwood, Mary, wife of Sir Edwyn Scudamore Francis Stanhope, bart., of Holme Lacy, Herefordshire.

Aug. 10. In Devonshire-st., Portland-pl., aged 79, Sir George Thomas Staunton, bart. The deceased baronet was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. After leaving college he was appointed Chief Supercargo for the East India Company, and was President of the Select Committee at Canton, and Commissioner of Embassy to Peking in 1816. He sat in various Parliaments between 1818 and 1852, for St. Michael's, Heytesbury, South Hants, and Portsmouth. Sir George was the author of a translation of the Penal Code of China, and has written several works, which are held to be authorities on the

subject, on our relations with that country. His father, the first baronet, was Secretary to Lord Macartney, Governor of Madras, and received his title after the negotiations of the peace with Tipoo Sultan in 1784. He was subsequently Secretary of Legation during Lord Macartney's well-known embassy to China in 1792.

Aug. 18. At Brighton, aged 87, Brigadier James Steel, C.B. "Col. Steel, C.B., served against the Garrows in 1810, when he was wounded; in Java in 1811; in Oude in 1817; in Arracan in 1824 and 1825. He was present at the siege and storm of Bhurtpore in 1826, for which he received the India medal; commanded the Second Fusiliers with the army of the Punjab during the campaign of 1848 and 1849, including the affair of Ramnuggur on the 22nd of November; was present at the passage of the Chenab, and in the actions of Chillianwalla and Goojerat, also in the subsequent pursuit of the Sikhs and Afghans by the force under Sir W. Gilbert—for which he received a medal and was made C.B."

May 29. Aged 86, the Rev. C. F. A. Steinkopff, D.D., Minister of the German Lutheran Church, Savoy, Strand, for 58 years, and formerly Foreign Secretary to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

June 21. At Moorhouse's Hotel, Albemarle-st., Catherine Augusta, Baroness de Sternberg, of Belsfield, Windermere.

Sept. 12. At Coblenz, in his 71st year, the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K.C.B., Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge, and formerly Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. The deceased was the son of Mr. James Stephen, Master of Chancery (well known for his writings and exertions between 1815 and 1830 on the subject of colonial slavery), and was born about the year 1790. He was educated at Trinity-hall, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1812. Having chosen the legal profession, he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn. He had hardly begun practice as a Chancery barrister when, in 1812 or 1813, he became connected officially with the public service as Counsel of the Colonial Department. For 11 years he was at once counsel for this department and a Chancery barrister in extensive practice. He then retired from the bar, and became at the same time both Counsel to the Colonial Department and Counsel to the Board of Trade. He held these

offices jointly for 10 years ; after which, during the Whig Government which succeeded the Reform Bill, he left the Board of Trade and became Assistant Under-Secretary for the Colonies. From the Assistant Under-Secretaryship he was subsequently promoted to the permanent Under-Secretaryship, spending 14 years in the two offices together. He was thus connected with the civil service 35 years in all, during the whole of which time his relations were mainly with the Colonial Department, in which his knowledge and administrative ability made him so powerful that he was commonly called "King Stephen." His impressions of the state of our Government offices, and of the Colonial Office in particular, derived from this long experience, were published, with other opinions on the same subject, in a Blue-book in 1855, when the question of the reorganization of the civil service, by the adoption of the system of appointments by competitive examination, instead of by patronage, was first agitated. The opinion there expressed on the condition of the public service, as regards the intellectual capacity and culture of the majority of those comprising it, is by no means favourable, but the writer speaks of splendid exceptions. Of these exceptions the writer himself was certainly one. While in the Colonial Office he was one of the ablest and most efficient public servants the State possessed, and his final retirement from the Colonial Under-Secretaryship in 1847 was a great loss to the Department. On his retirement he was made a K.C.B. in recognition of his public services. It was not only, however, as a public official that he had up to that time distinguished himself. A man of general thought and culture, he had all along employed his leisure in studies ranging beyond the topics that interested him as an official ; and he had latterly contributed extensively to the *Edinburgh Review* on subjects relating to the history of the Church and the development of religious opinions. A collection of these articles, already widely known and appreciated in their scattered shape, was published in two volumes in 1849 under the title of "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography." In the same year Sir James Stephen was appointed to succeed William Smyth, M.A., as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, which office he held to his death. He had previously held the Professorship of Modern History at Hailey-

bury College, up to the dissolution of that establishment. In 1851 he published two volumes, "Lectures on the History of France." These works have given the author a high and peculiar place in our graver contemporary literature.

Oct. 12. At his residence in Gloucestersq., Hyde-park, aged 56, the other of the two greatest engineers of the age, Robert Stephenson, the constructor of the first effective locomotive steam-engine, of the London and Birmingham Railway, of the high-level bridge at Newcastle, of the Victoria bridge at Berwick, of a stupendous bridge over the Nile, inventor of the tubular bridge system, on which he constructed first that at Conway, next, the Britannia bridge over the Menai Straits, and, lastly, that stupendous masterpiece, the Victoria bridge over the St. Lawrence. Mr. Stephenson was, besides, the constructor of the Midland, Blackwall, Northern and Eastern, Norfolk, and Chester and Holyhead railways, and of many branch lines of railway in England ; and the designer, or at least, consulting engineer, of the national railway systems of Belgium, Norway, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Tuscany, Canada, Egypt, and India. He was, moreover, the engineer of many large undertakings which would have made the fame of any other man, but which pass as the mere *pièces d'essai* or relaxations of Robert Stephenson. He may also be considered, in rivalry with Mr. Brunel, as the champion of the narrow gauge against the broad gauge ; of rigid tubular bridges against tension and suspended bridges ; and of locomotive engines *versus* stationary engines. In the first of these contests experience has proved him the wiser ; in the second contest, both have achieved splendid success ; in the third, his antagonist was fairly driven from the field.

Robert Stephenson was certainly born under very humble circumstances. George Stephenson, his father, deemed himself a right happy man when, on earnings of 1*l.* a week, he could offer his hand and fortune to the pretty farm-servant, Fanny Henderson. He took her to his home at Willington-quay, on the north bank of the Tyne, about six miles below Newcastle, towards the end of 1802, and his biographer tells us that his signature, as it appears in the parish books on the occasion of his marriage, was that of a person who had just learnt to write. On the 16th of December in the following year, George Stephenson's only son, Robert,

DEATHS.

was born; and there, on Willington-quay, he was familiarized from his earliest years with the steady industry of his parents; for when his father was not busy in shoe-making or cutting out shoe-lasts, or cleaning clocks, or making clothes for the pit-men, he was occupied with some drawing or model with which he sought to improve himself. Robert's mother very soon died, and his father, whose heart was bound up in the boy, had to take the sole charge of him. George Stephenson felt deeply his own want of education, and in order that his son might not suffer from the same cause, sent him first to a school at Long Benton, and afterwards to the school of a Mr. Bruce, in Newcastle, one of the best seminaries of the district, although the latter was rather expensive for Stephenson. There young Robert remained for three years, and his father not only encouraged him to study for himself, but also made him, in a measure, the instrument of his own better education, by getting the lad to read for him at the library in Newcastle, and bring home the results of his weekly acquirements, as well as frequently a scientific book, which father and son studied together. On leaving school, at the age of fifteen, Robert Stephenson was apprenticed to Mr. Nicholas Wood, at Killingworth, to learn the business of the colliery, where he served for three years, and became familiar with all the departments of underground work. His father was engaged at the same colliery, and the evenings of both were usually devoted to their mutual improvement. George Stephenson felt the powers that stirred within him, and that they heaved with unwieldy efforts because they had not been developed and trained by education. He resolved that, let the self-sacrifice be what it would, his son should suffer from no such want; and straining his small means, sent him, in the year 1820, to the Edinburgh University, where Hope was lecturing on chemistry, Sir John Leslie on natural philosophy, and Jameson on natural history. Though young Stephenson remained in Edinburgh but six months, it is supposed that he did as much work in that time as most students do in a three years' course. It cost his father some 80*l.*, but the money was not grudged when the son returned to Killingworth in the summer of 1821, bringing with him the prize for mathematics, which he had gained at the University.

In 1822 Robert Stephenson was ap-

prenticed to his father, who had by this time started his locomotive manufactory at Newcastle; but his health giving way after a couple of years' exertion, he accepted a commission to examine the gold and silver mines of South America. The change of air and scene contributed to the restoration of his health, and, after having founded the Silver Mining Company of Columbia, he returned to England in December, 1827, by way of the United States and Canada, in time to assist his father in the arrangements of the Liverpool and Manchester railway, by placing himself at the head of the factory at Newcastle. About this time, indeed, he seems to have almost exclusively devoted his attention to the study of the locomotive engine. How well he succeeded in carrying out the ideas of his father was afterwards seen when he obtained the prize of 500*l.* offered by the directors of the Liverpool and Manchester railway for the best locomotive. This engine, however, which was called the "Rocket," was far from perfect, and was not destined to be the future model. The young engineer saw where the machine was defective, and designed the "Planet," which, with its multitubular boiler, with cylinders in the smoke-box, with its cranked axletree, and with its external framework, forms, in spite of some modifications, the type of the locomotive engines employed up to the present day. About the same time he designed, for the United States, an engine specially adapted to the curves of American railways, and named it the "Bogie," after a kind of low waggon used on the quay at Newcastle. To Robert Stephenson we are accordingly indebted for the type of the locomotive engines used in both hemispheres.

The next great work upon which Mr. Stephenson was engaged was the survey and construction of the London and Birmingham railway, which he undertook in 1833. He had already been employed in the execution of a branch from the Liverpool and Manchester railway, and in the construction of the Leicester and Swannington line, so that he brought to his new undertaking considerable experience. On being appointed engineer to the company he settled in London, and had the satisfaction of seeing the first sod cut on the first of June, 1834, at Chalk Farm. The line was complete in four years, and on the 15th of September, 1838, was opened. The difficulties of this vast un-

dertaking are now all forgotten, but at the time they were so formidable that one poor fellow who had contracted for the Kilsby tunnel, died of fright at the responsibility which he had assumed. In carrying out this great undertaking he worked with amazing energy, walking the whole distance between London and Birmingham more than twenty times in the course of his superintendence. All this time, however, he had not ceased to devote his attention to the manufactory in Newcastle, convinced that good locomotives are the first step to rapid transit; and his assistance was sought by many companies anxious to secure his advice if not more constant service. His evidence before Parliamentary committees was grasped at, and it may be said that in one way or another he has been engaged on all the railways in England, while, in conjunction with his father, he has directed the execution of more than a third of the various lines in the country. Father and son were consulted as to the Belgium system of railways, and obtained from King Leopold the Cross of the Legion of Honour in 1844. For similar services performed in Norway, which he visited in 1846, Robert Stephenson received the Grand Cross of St. Olof. So also he assisted either in actually making or in laying out the systems of lines in Switzerland, in Germany, in Denmark, in Tuscany, in Canada, in Egypt, and in India. In the sphere of railways he has been, since the death of his father, the foremost man, the safest guide, the most active worker.

It is, however, in the bridges which he erected for railway purposes that his genius as an engineer is most strikingly displayed, and by these it is that he will be best remembered. The most remarkable of these have been already named—they are the high-level bridge at Newcastle, constructed of wood and iron, the Victoria bridge at Berwick, built of stone and brick, the bridge in wrought and cast iron across the Nile, the Conway and the Britannia bridges over the Menai Straits, and the Victoria bridge over the St. Lawrence. A full account of most of these works will be found in an article on iron bridges, contributed by Mr. Stephenson himself, to the "Encyclopædia Britannica." They are all splendid works, and have made his name famous over the world. The idea of the tubular bridge was an utter novelty, and, as carried out at the Menai Straits, was a grand achieve-

ment. Considering the enormous span of a bridge placed across these straits, the immense weight which it has to sustain, and the height to which it must be raised in order that great ships may pass beneath, the undertaking seemed chimerical, and he must have been a man of great daring, as well as of no common experience, who could think of conquering the difficulty. Robert Stephenson, however, fairly faced the difficulty, and threw bridges of 460 feet span from pier to pier across this formidable gulf. It was the first thing of the kind ever attempted, and the success was so triumphant, that, under Mr. Stephenson's auspices, it has been repeated more than once. In the Egyptian railway there are two tubular bridges, one over the Damietta branch of the Nile, and the other over the large canal near Besket-al-Saba; but they have this peculiarity, that the trains run not, as at the Menai Straits, within the tube, but on the outside upon the top. It is with this method of tubular bridging that Stephenson's name is peculiarly identified, and by which he will probably be best known to posterity as distinguished from his father, who has almost the entire credit of the railway system.

There is scarcely any department of engineering in which Robert Stephenson was not consulted as a paramount authority; and as consulting engineer he was connected with many large undertakings—among them the new systems for the water supply of London and Liverpool, and the project for constructing an oceanic canal across the Isthmus of Suez. Amid these colossal undertakings and world-embracing schemes Robert Stephenson retained in undiminished clearness his early acquirements as a practical engineer—he was as ready to devise and construct the smallest mechanical appliance as to throw a bridge over Niagara. Nor was he less diligent or less skilful in the accessories of great undertakings—his plans and specifications were perfect and have since served as types for those of all subsequent undertakings of their several kinds.

In speaking of the works of two great men their capacity is to be measured by the success of their undertakings considered as the conceptions of science and art. It may be permitted to divide the prize of lofty design and great execution between the great rivals Stephenson and Brunel. There is, however, another point of view which is of paramount

DEATHS.

importance considered in its ultimate bearing upon the interests of society—the commercial and pecuniary view. In this light Stephenson may be considered a double benefactor to his species—for most of his undertakings were commercial successes to his clients—those of Brunel, unhappily, the reverse.

It seems unjust to morality to distinguish between public and private virtue. If to be conscientious in our dealings with our fellow-men be virtue, Stephenson was virtuous in every phase of public life—and in equal degree he possessed those qualities which are the substance and grace of private worth. If his loss will be felt severely in his profession, it will be still more poignantly felt in his large circle of friends and acquaintances, for he was as good as he was great, and the man was even more to be admired than the engineer. His benevolence was unbounded, and every year he expended thousands in doing good unseen. His chief care in this way was for the children of old friends who had been kind to him in early life, sending them to the best schools and providing for them with characteristic generosity. His own pupils regarded him with a sort of worship, and the number of men belonging to the Stephenson school who have taken very high rank in their peculiar walk shows how successful he was in his system of training, and how strong was the force of his example. The feeling of his friends and associates was not less warm. A man of the soundest judgment and the strictest probity, with a noble heart and most genial manner, he won the confidence of all who knew him, and perhaps in all London there were not more pleasant social gatherings than those which were to be found in his house in Gloucester-square, he himself being the life of the party. Without a spark of professional jealousy in his own nature, he was liked by all his fellow engineers, if they did not know him sufficiently to bear him affection; and we do not believe that even those who had the most reason to wish him out of the way, such as the promoters of the Suez Canal, which he strenuously opposed, ever bore him any ill-will. He has passed away, if not very full of years, yet very full of honours—the creator of public works, a benefactor of his race, the idol of his friends.

The universal wish accorded a tomb in Westminster Abbey to the great engineer, and on the 21st October his remains were

interred in that venerable receptacle of so many of our greatest men. His funeral was considered strictly private, but it wanted nothing but the name of a public ceremonial. His remains are placed in the middle of the nave near those of Telford, the constructor of the Suspension Bridge, which spans the Menai Straits a short distance from his own.

Robert Stephenson died possessed of personal property sworn under 400,000*l.*, which he has disposed of in a characteristic manner. Bequeathing the larger share to his nearest relatives his cousins, he gives considerable sums to his friends, particularly those who had been his efficient assistants in his great undertakings; nor are his servants overlooked. He has bequeathed legacies amounting to 25,000*l.* to various philosophical and educational institutions, among which those in Newcastle take a large share. To the Newcastle Infirmary he has given 10,000*l.* To the Literary and Philosophical Society of that town 7000*l.*—this in addition to a debt of 8100*l.* which he had already paid off—This he has done, to use his own phrase, in gratitude for the benefits which he himself had received from it in early life, and in the hope that other young men might find it equally useful.

Aug. 28. At his lodging in Pall-mall, aged 78, Thomas Stewardson, esq., Portrait Painter to Queen Caroline. He was a pupil of Romney, and attained so great a reputation that he was appointed Court Painter. This brought him many clients. Among the works of his pencil may be named the portraits of King George III. and his Queen, Canning, the handsome Marchioness of Winchester, Sir Pulteney Malcolm, Lord Onslow, Lord Skelmersdale, Sir James Little. Many more of different degrees in elevated political, military, naval, and literary and scientific life, came livingly from his popular easel. A considerable number of these have been engraved and published. He retired from the practice of his art upwards of thirty years ago, and his name is well nigh forgotten.

May 19. At Rome, Lieut.-Colonel Stisted, an old Peninsular officer.

June 12. Suddenly, at Leamington, Warwickshire, aged 63, Lieut.-Colonel Henry Francis Stokes, late of Thirty-ninth Regt. He served throughout the Burmese war, and was also at the battle of Maharajpooor, and had received two war medals.

DEATHS.

Nov. 16. Robert Stokes, esq., aged 76, for many years Assistant Secretary to the African Civilization Society, and also Secretary to the Trustees of the Mico Charity, in Buckingham-st., Strand.

Nov. 18. At Russell House, Tavistock-sq., aged 60, Frank Stone, esq., A.R.A.

Mr. Stone was a native of Manchester, and began his career as an artist at a very early age. His success induced him to come to London, where he soon became a successful exhibitor at the Water Colour Society. When about 40 he sent his first oil-painting to the Royal Academy, and was elected an Associate in about ten years. His works have always been among the attractions of "the Exhibition," and indeed they were peculiarly well adapted to please the general run of visitors; for he was the faithful depicter of human nature in its phase of civilized life. In this line he possessed something like inspiration. His peculiar strength will be best appreciated by naming a few of his pictures—such as "The Last Appeal," "Cross Purposes," "The Impending Mate," "Mated." These charming representations of social life have been repeatedly engraved. Some six or seven years ago Mr. Stone's style underwent a change, which indicated more force and vigour than had been shown in his earlier productions. A residence at the sea-side braced the nerves of his body and his mind at the same time, and the result was reproduced on canvas. The activity of the sea and those that earn their bread thereon, the wild waves of the sea, and the picturesque occupations, the vivid groupings, and fanciful costumes of the fisher life, were now his favourite subjects; and while he retained his powers of delineating with charming simplicity the beauty of the human countenance, his works acquired a breadth, a texture, and a simplicity not to be found in his pictures of boudoir life; and his dramatic power of conception and treatment proved to be of a far higher nature than had been before suspected.

April 1. At Rosseville, Chilton Polden, near Bridgewater, William Stradling, esq. Mr. Stradling was a zealous and intelligent local antiquary, and had formed a valuable museum of British and Roman antiquities collected in the West of England. He was descended from the ancient family of the Stradlings of St. Donyat's Castle, Glamorganshire.

Sept. 8. The Hon. George Charles Fox Strangways, of Brickworth House, near

Salisbury, youngest son of the second Earl of Ilchester, and formerly M.P. for Calne.

Sept. 7. At his seat, Dumfries House, Ayr, aged 64, Lord Patrick James Herbert Crichton Stuart, M.P. for the Ayr district of Burghs, and Lord-Lieut. of the county of Bute. His lordship was the second son of the late John Lord Mountstuart, younger brother of the second, and uncle of the present Marquis of Bute. The family interest of the Bute family is paramount in Cardiff, Ayrshire, and Bute: Lord Patrick consequently found a seat in the House of Commons for one or other of those constituencies from 1818 to 1857. In this long Parliamentary career, his lordship consistently advocated a liberal policy, and his large family connections gave great weight to his moderate counsels. By the premature death of his brother in 1848, Lord Patrick became guardian, as he was then heir presumptive, to his infant nephew. As manager of the large family estates he was enabled to exercise an extensive influence over a large and wild population. It is needless to say that this power was exercised for good; and the reverence in which he was held by all within the circle of his influence proves how wisely and how unceasing he worked to benefit those whom Providence had committed to his charge.

Jan. 24. At Cottesmore Rectory, Rutland, the Hon. Mrs. Stuart.

May 14. At Edgbaston, near Birmingham, aged 65, Joseph Sturge, an eminent member of the Society of Friends.

Mr. Sturge was born of Quaker parents, at Elberton, Gloucestershire, and was the sixth member of the family bearing in direct succession the name of Joseph Sturge, which he now transmits to his son, a boy of twelve years of age. In conjunction with a brother he carried on an extensive business as a corn-merchant, first at Bewdley, and subsequently at Birmingham.

In 1834 he married Eliza, daughter of Mr. James Cropper, of Liverpool, and thus became related to the extensive philanthropic family circle of which that eminent man was the centre. This union was, however, of a very brief duration; and Mr. Sturge afterwards, in 1846, married Hannah, daughter of Mr. Barnard Dickenson, of Coalbrooke Dale, who survives him, and by whom he leaves one son and four daughters.

From early life Mr. Sturge actively par-

DEATHS.

ticipated in the various philanthropic movements of the day, but specially devoted himself to the Anti-Slavery cause. But he also took a very leading part in all the questions agitated by the Liberal party, particularly in establishing the Anti-Corn-law League, and the movement for extending the suffrage. In 1842 he contested the borough of Nottingham with the late Mr. Walter, and was defeated by a small majority; but the election was conducted by such questionable means that though Mr. Walter was unseated for corruption Mr. Sturge did not stand again.

In 1840 Mr. Sturge had been solicited to stand as a candidate for Birmingham, but did not go to the poll, having been withdrawn upon an understanding that the whole Liberal party would support him at the next vacancy. In 1844, upon the death of Mr. Joshua Scholefield, he was again brought forward; but the arrangement which had been previously made was not carried out, and the result was the return of the Tory candidate, Mr. Spooner. The following year, when all Europe was convulsed with revolutions, Mr. Sturge attended at Brussels the first of that remarkable series of Peace Congresses which continued to be held annually in the principal cities of Europe until 1852, and at all of which he was present, and had a principal share in the guidance of their proceedings. The year 1848 was also signalized by his interviews with the members of the Provisional Government of France, especially Lamartine and Arago, on the subjects of peace and slavery, resulting in the decree which abolished slavery throughout the French colonies. One of the best-known incidents of Mr. Sturge's public life was his visit to the Emperor of Russia in February, 1854. Accompanied by two friends, Mr. Charlton and Mr. Pease, M.P., he formed a deputation from the Society of Friends to present to the Emperor an address of remonstrance against the war solely on religious grounds. Notwithstanding his extreme opinions upon all these points, Mr. Sturge was held in the greatest respect and reverence—not more by his friends than by his opponents.

Feb. 26. At Worlington, near Mildenhall, Suffolk, aged 55, Lieut.-Colonel Nelson Suckling, late of H.M.'s Thirty-second Regiment.

Aug. 15. At Upper Grosvenor-street, aged 48, Charlotte Dowager Lady Suffield, only daughter of the second Lord

Gardner, and widow of the fourth Lord Suffield.

Sept. 4. At his residence, Saville-place, Newcastle, Aubone Surtees, esq., of Piddon and Newcastle. Mr. Surtees was one of the family who felt that Miss Surtees had formed a sad *mésalliance* when she ran away with an undistinguished barrister named John Scott: but John Scott lived to be the Earl of Eldon, and Lord Chancellor.

Feb. 20. In Curzon-street, aged 47, the Countess of Sandwich, second daughter of the late Field-Marshal the Marquis of Anglesea, by his second marriage with Lady Charlotte Cadogan.

June 7. At Park-cresc., Oxford, Catherine, daughter of the late Maurice Swabey, D.C.L., and widow of the Rev. W. O. Freeman, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Milton.

July 8. At Stockholm, in his 61st year, Oscar I., King of Sweden. The deceased monarch was the son of Bernadotte (or Charles John XIV.), whom he succeeded in 1844. His Majesty was born in 1799, and married, in 1823, the Princess Josephine Maximilienne Eugène, daughter of Eugène, Duke of Leuchtenberg, by whom he had several children. He is succeeded by his eldest son, Prince Charles (King Charles XV.), who was appointed Regent by royal ordinance in 1857, when his father's illness rendered necessary the abnegation of Royal authority.

May 12. At Billingham, Mr. John Surtees, aged 100 years (born February 27, 1759).

Nov. 5. At Brighton, Georgiana Maria, Dowager Lady de Tabley.

March 8. At the residence of his brother, the Bishop of London, in St. James's-square, Colonel Thomas F. Tait, C.B., Aide-de-Camp to the Queen.

Colonel Tait was well known in India as the commander of the Third Bengal Irregular Cavalry, which, as "Tait's Horse," was much distinguished, and did good service in General Pollock's expedition to Cabul, and in the Sutlej and Punjab campaigns. Colonel Tait commanded his Irregulars at the battles of Tiseen and Mammoo Kale under Pollock; at Ferozepore, under Littler, when besieged by the whole Sikh army; and, under Hardinge and Gough, at the battles of Ferozeshah, Ramnugger, Chillianwallah, and Goojerat.

June 25. At his residence in Hertford-street, Mayfair, aged 82, Charles Augustus Bennet, Earl of Tankerville and Baron

DEATHS.

Ossulston, of Ossulston, county of Middlesex, in the Peerage of Great Britain.

The deceased was eldest son of Charles, fourth Earl, and Emma, second daughter and coheir of Sir James Colebrooke. He was born 28th of April, 1776. He married, the 28th July, 1806, Mademoiselle Corisande Grammont, daughter of the late Duc de Grammont, by whom he leaves issue. The late Earl sat in the House of Commons for Steyning, and subsequently, from 1806 to 1818, represented Knaresborough. He was appointed in 1806 Treasurer to the King's Household, when he was made a Privy Councillor; but of late years, from partial blindness, he abstained from all matters of public business.

July 22. At Dover, aged 74, Richard Tattersall, esq., of Hyde-park-corner, who was for many years the proprietor of "The Cornet," so well known to sporting men of all classes.

Feb. 9. At Fairlawn House, Tunbridge Wells, Lady Sarah Taylor.

April 11. In Berkeley-square, Bristol, aged 70, Mr. John Taylor, for nearly fifty years proprietor of the *Bristol Mirror*.

March 25. At Edinburgh, aged 92, Mrs. Taylor, widow of Mr. James Taylor, who was the first to discover and apply steam to the propulsion of vessels, having enjoyed for many years, as the widow of the discoverer of steam navigation, a pension (a very inadequate one) from Government.

April 7. At Connaught-terrace, Hyde-park, Lady Teesdale, widow of Major-General Sir G. Teesdale, K.H.

April 6. At Tong Hall, near Bradford, aged 85, Colonel J. P. Tempest.

April 8. At Aghada Hall, county Cork, aged 78, Lieutenant-General Sir Joseph Thackwell, G.C.B. and K.H., Colonel of the Sixteenth Lancers. He was born 1781, and was fourth son of the late John Thackwell, esq., of Morton Court and Rye Court, Worcestershire, the direct descendant of the Rev. Thomas Thackwell, Rector of Waterperry, Oxfordshire, in 1607. He obtained a commission in the Worcestershire Mounted Fencibles at a very early age, and served in Ireland during the Rebellion. He entered the Fifteenth Hussars as a cornet in 1800, in which regiment he served for more than thirty years. He served under Sir John Moore in Spain in 1808-9, and was present at Corunna; shared in the campaigns of 1813-14 in the Peninsula, including the battles of Vittoria, the Pyrenees, in front

of Pampeluna, 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th July; blockade of Pampeluna from 18th to the 31st October, when it surrendered; battle of Orthes, affair at Tarbes, and battle of Toulouse, besides many affairs of advanced guards, outposts, &c. At Granada he boldly attacked and forced back upwards of two hundred French dragoons with fifty of the Fifteenth Hussars, making several prisoners, for which he was recommended for the rank of Brevet-Major by Lord Combermere. Served also the campaign of 1815, including the action at Quatre Bras, the retreat on the following day, and battle of Waterloo. He was gazetted Major, 1815, and Lieutenant-Colonel of the fifteenth in 1820. He was engaged in suppressing many riots, at Nottingham, Birmingham, &c. At Birmingham, in 1816, he received an almost fatal injury on the head from a brickbat. He became a local Major-General in India in 1838, and commanded the cavalry division in the Afghan campaign of 1838-9, and was present at Ghuznee, for which services he received the K.C.B. He commanded the cavalry division in the battle of Maharajpore, 1843; was chief of the cavalry throughout the Sulej war in 1846, and was present at Sobraon, where he led the Third Light Dragoons in single file into the intrenchments during the heat of the battle. He also commanded the cavalry in the Punjab campaign in 1848-9, during which he repulsed the Sikh army under Shere Sing, at Sadoolapore, with a small British detachment. He was contused on the right shoulder at Vittoria, and twice severely wounded at Waterloo (left arm amputated close to the shoulder), in charging squares of infantry, also having two horses shot under him. He was gazetted a G.C.B. in 1849, and had the order of the second class of the Dooranee Empire. Sir Joseph received the thanks of the House of Commons on three separate occasions. His conduct at Waterloo has been thus described:—"Sir Joseph was wounded in what the doctors call the fore-arm of his left arm. This, one would think, would stop most men; but no, he instantly seized his bridle with his right hand, in which was his sword, and still dashed on at the head of his regiment—the command of the Fifteenth having devolved upon him—to charge the enemy. Another shot took effect, luckily on the same arm, already wounded, about ten inches higher up. The arm was amputated very near

DEATHS.

the shoulder-joint; but such was the gallant fellow's desire to be on duty, that he actually joined us again in France within a few weeks, with his stump *unhealed*." Sir Joseph married Maria Audriah, eldest daughter of Francis Roche, esq., of Roche-mount, Cork County, and grand uncle of Lord Fermoy. He survived his three brothers,—John Thackwell, of Wilton Place, Deputy-Lieut. and Justice of the Peace for Gloucestershire; William Thackwell, of Morton Court, an officer in the Yeomanry Cavalry; and the Rev. Stephen Thackwell, Rector of Birtsmorton, Worcestershire.

His commissions in the army were dated—Cornet, 1800; Lieutenant, 1801; Captain, 1807; Major, 1815; Lieut.-Colonel, 1817; Colonel, 1837; Major-General, 1846; Lieut.-General, 1854; Colonel of the Sixteenth Lancers, 10th Nov. 1849.

March 21. At Calais, aged 83, Thomas Theobald, esq., of Grays Thurrock, Essex.

Sept. 24. At Hombourg, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, aged 76, Denzil Ibbetson Thompson, esq., of Great Cumberland-pl., Hyde-park, J.P. and Deputy-Lieut. for the county of Middlesex.

March. Drowned at sea, on his passage from Malta to England, by falling overboard from the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steam-packet *Ripon*, aged 62, Rear-Adm. Sam. Thornton.

May 10. At her residence, Kingston-sq., Bath, aged 84, Elizabeth, relict of Robert Tindal, esq., father of the late Lord Chief Justice Tindal.

April 14. At Paris, aged 54, Alexis Charles Henry de Tocqueville, the well-known writer on public law, a statesman, and a member of the French Institute. He was born at Verneuil, in the Seine-et-Oise, July 29, 1805, and by his mother's side was great-grandson of Malesherbes. After having been admitted to the Paris bar in 1826, he was appointed an examining magistrate at Versailles, and in 1830 a supplementary judge. The year following he was commissioned, together with M. C. de Beaumont, to make a journey to the United States to study the penitentiary system in that country. On his return he published, in 1835, his celebrated work, "*La Démocratie en Amérique*," which has been translated into most languages. The year following M. de Tocqueville replaced M. Laromignière at the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and in 1841 he succeeded the Count de Cessac at the French Academy.

He had taken his seat in the Chamber of Deputies in 1839, where he represented Valogne until 1848. He sat among the moderate Opposition, who attacked to warn and not to overthrow. Member and chairman of the committees on slavery in 1840, the penitentiary system in 1848, and the maritime interests of Algeria in 1847, he afforded great assistance to the Government by his labours, but otherwise he proved himself the adversary of the ministerial policy and of the system of electoral corruption. "A great revolution is approaching," said he, in January, 1848. His prophecy was shortly fulfilled. He was elected a member of the Constituent Assembly for the department of La Manche, and was placed third on a list of fifteen representatives by a majority of 170,714 votes. He combated socialist doctrines, particularly those respecting the organization of labour; and, except on the question of the banishment of the Orleans family, he voted constantly with the Right. General Cavaignac commissioned him to represent France at the Conference which was opened at Brussels for the settlement of the affairs of Italy. M. de Tocqueville was re-elected to the Legislative Assembly, and on the 3rd of June, 1849, was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs, and took an important part in the debates on the expedition to Rome, which he defended against every attack. He quitted the Ministry when the system was inaugurated by the Message of the 31st of October. Having again become a simple representative, he opposed the policy of the Elysée, and remained one of the last defenders of the Parliamentary system. On the 2nd of December, 1851, he, with other deputies, assembled at the Mairie of the 10th arrondissement to protest against the *coup d'état*. He was imprisoned with his colleagues, but was shortly afterwards set at liberty, and retired from public life. His compulsory leisure was occupied in that memorable inquiry into the causes of the French Revolution which has become a text-book to all public men in all countries where it is permitted to be read. M. de Tocqueville was named a Knight of the Legion of Honour on the 17th November, 1828.

Nov. 3. At Ham House, aged 82, Wm. James Felix Tolle-mache, esq., only son of the late Hon. Felix Tolle-mache.

Aug. 31. At Topsham, aged 67, Major-Gen. Tothill, R.M. The deceased, as an officer of Marines, served in many gal-

DEATHS.

lant affairs in the course of the French war.

Oct. 13. At Catlodge, Inverness-shire, aged 62, Major-Gen. Towers, formerly of the Seventh Hussars.

May 18. At Oughtlington Hall, Chester, aged 88, Trafford Trafford, esq.

Dec. 6. At Marine-parade, Brighton, aged 84, Gen. Sir Frederick William Trench. He entered the army in 1803, and was formerly aide-de-camp to their late Majesties King George IV. and William IV. He represented St. Michael's in Parliament from 1807 to 1812; Dundalk, 1812 to 1818; Cambridge, 1819 to 1832; and Scarborough 1835 to 1847.

Dec. 10. At Bosworth Hall, Leicester-shire, aged 77, George Fortescue Turville, esq.

Nov. 25. At the Vicarage, Heston, the Rev. Henry Scott Trimmer, last surviving son of the celebrated Mrs. Trimmer; and on the 27th, Mary Driver Trimmer, wife of the above. They had been married fifty-six years, and Mrs. Trimmer survived the shock of her husband's death only forty-eight hours.

July 13. At his residence in London, aged 56, Rear-Adm. Henry Dundas Trotter. He was seized with a paralytic attack while at the Hydrographic Department at the Admiralty. The gallant Arctic voyageur was at once removed to his residence, but expired shortly afterwards. He entered the service in 1818, and had served in the navy actively until he obtained his flag-rank. He was born in September, 1802.

May 6. At Newrath, Wicklow, aged 42, Col. J. A. Udney, of Udney, Aide-de-Camp to the Lord-Lieut. of Ireland.

July 17. On board H.M.'s ship *Magicienne*, at Shanghai, from the effects of wounds received in leading a land attack at Peiho, on the 25th June, aged 39, Captain Nicholas Vansittart.

April 22. Aged 51, Arthur Vansittart, esq., of Shottesbrook Park, Berkshire, and Foot's Cray-pl., Kent.

April 29. In London, aged 55, Sir R. W. Vaughan, bart., of Rug Nannau, and Hengwrt, Merionethshire.

July 31. At Hampton Court Palace, aged 86, Margaret, widow of Major-Gen. John Agmondisham Vesey.

Jan. 15. At Little Farlington House, Gloucestershire, aged 84, William Vizard, esq., who was attorney for the defence on the trial of the late Queen Caroline.

Oct. 24. At Hastings, aged 70, Vice-Adm. the Right Hon. William, eighth

Earl of Waldegrave, and Viscount Chewton, Baron Waldegrave, a baronet of the United Kingdom, and C.B.; born at Navestock Hall, in Essex, on the 27th of October, 1788. His lordship was the fourth son of the fourth Earl, and had the misfortune, while yet in his infancy, to lose his father.

Of the sons, George, the fifth Earl, was unfortunately drowned at Eton. He was succeeded by his next brother, John James, sixth Earl, who entered the army, and served with his regiment, the Seventh Hussars, in the Peninsular war, and also in the short campaign which ended afterwards in the battle of Waterloo. The third son, Edward, was also in the military service, and, after sharing in the disastrous retreat of Sir John Moore at Corunna, was drowned, with all hands, by the wreck of the transport in which many of the cavalry were returning to England, on the Manacle Rocks.

William, the fourth son, at the early age of 12 years, chose the navy as his profession. He entered the navy under the most favourable auspices, in the *Theseus*, 74, bearing the flag of his uncle, Lord Radstock. In the *Medusa*, 32, he was present at the capture of three Spanish frigates laden with treasure, and the destruction of the fourth off Cape St. Mary, Oct. 5, 1804. In the early part of 1805, the *Medusa* conveyed the Marquis Cornwallis, as Governor-General, to India. After serving in several ships continually engaged in active service, he was lieutenant of *Ville de Paris*, bearing the flag of Lord Collingwood, in 1809, and served with the boats of a squadron under Lieutenant John Tailour, at the capture and destruction of the French armed storeship *Lamproie*, of 16 guns, and numerous armed vessels and merchantmen, defended by numerous strong batteries in the Bay of Rosas, after a desperate struggle, and a loss to the British of fifteen killed and fifty-five wounded. For his gallantry on this occasion he was named in Lord Collingwood's public letter, and sent home with the despatches; and on his arrival at home, he was promoted to the rank of Commander. In 1810 he was appointed to the *Melpomene*, which, after General Massena's retreat from before Torres Vedras, assisted in carrying the British army, under General Hill, across the Tagus; and was made post into the *Macedonia* in 1811.

In 1829 he was appointed to Her

DEATHS.

Majesty's ship *Seringapatam*, 46, on the South American station. He was sent by Government to investigate the state of the islands of the South Pacific, and to report upon their conversion to Christianity. Subsequently he acted as senior officer in the Pacific from May, 1830, till April, 1832. In the year 1839 he was appointed to the command of Her Majesty's ship *Revenge*, 78, and took a distinguished part in the bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre. In December, 1840, he was made a Companion of the Bath. In September and October, 1841, he was senior officer in the Bay of Tunis, with the *Ganges*, 84, and the *Implacable*, 74, under his orders. He obtained the captain's good service pension in February, 1842, and returned to England the next month. In 1846 he accepted the rank of Rear-Admiral on the Retired List, in accordance with his own long-expressed opinion, that the good discipline and thorough vigour of the British navy would be best maintained by the older officers retiring, and making way for their younger brethren in the service. In the same year he succeeded to the family dignity as eighth Earl of Waldegrave, on the death of his nephew.

In 1812 he married Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Mr. Samuel Whitbread by Lady Elizabeth Grey. This introduced him to a wide political circle, distinguished not only for its liberal views, but a widely-extended benevolence which sought the amelioration of the lower classes with large means. On the early death of Mr. Whitbread he was elected to fill that gentleman's seat for Bedford, and remained in Parliament until 1818, when he resigned in favour of his brother-in-law. During the intervals of sea service, and when he had retired from active service, the Earl's attention was devoted to various plans for improving the condition of the lower orders. As manager of his brother's estates in Somersetshire he was able to do much for the benefit of the miners of that district; and his interference in favour of the coal-whippers of the port of London was prompt and effectual to redeem that oppressed class from their bondage. His private charities to those who dwelt around him were large and judicious. The Earl married secondly Mrs. Milward, of Hastings, at which place he subsequently resided. The Earl's eldest son, Viscount Chewton, a Captain in the Fusilier Guards, was killed at the battle of the Alma, leaving two sons, the

eldest of whom succeeds his grandfather in the family honours.

Nov. 24. Aged 70, Commander Wm. Walford, R.N., of London-road, Ipswich. The deceased served in the *Bellerophon*, 74, at the battle of Trafalgar, in 1805, and was senior lieutenant of the *Bellerophon* when Napoleon Buonaparte surrendered to that ship off Rochefort in July, 1815.

Sept. 13. At Halkin-terr., Belgrave-sq., aged 69, Miss Walhouse, eldest daughter of the late Moreton Walhouse, esq., of Hatherton, Staffordshire, and sister of Lord Hatherton.

Aug. 23. At Pen-maen-mawr, Carnarvonshire, aged 61, Helen Lady Walker, widow of General Sir George Townshend Walker, bart., G.C.B., K.C.T. and S., &c.

Sept. 16. At Petersham-house, Surrey, aged 75, Wm. Kenworthy Walker, esq., late of the Grange, Leicestershire, a Magistrate for the county of Leicester.

May 1. At Stockton-upon-Tees, aged 78, Mr. John Walker, chemist, the original inventor of lucifer-matches.

June 7. In Gibson-sq., by suicide, aged 34, Captain Wm. Arnold Wallinger, late of the First West India Regiment, and son of Mr. Sergeant Wallinger.

Dec. 10. At Sydenham, aged 73, Col. the Hon. John Walpole, brother of the Earl of Orford. The deceased officer served with the Guards in the Peninsula, and was severely wounded at the siege of Burgos. He represented King's Lynn in Parliament from 1827 to 1831; was private secretary to Viscount Palmerston, when Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, from November, 1830, till August, 1833; when he was appointed Consul-General at Chili. He was promoted to the rank of Chargé d'Affaires in May, 1841.

March 1. At Lisbon, George D. Walsh, esq., the principal of the eminent house of Morrogh, Walsh, and Co. Mr. Walsh was the oldest British resident of Lisbon, and had acquired great influence in that city. His funeral was attended by a large number of the Portuguese nobility, gentry, and merchants, and the pall was supported by great nobles.

Jan. 25. At the Rectory, Haselbury Bryan, near Blandford, aged 73, the Rev. Henry Walter, B.D., and F.R.S., Rector of that parish. He was a member of Jesus College, Cambridge, and in 1806 was Second Wrangler, the present Lord Chief Baron Pollock being Senior Wrangler. For some time Mr. Walter held the office

DEATHS.

of Professor of Natural Philosophy at Haileybury.

March 12. At Kensington, aged 33, Captain Marr Ward, of Her Majesty's Tenth Regiment of Foot, and formerly of the Ceylon Rifles, a son of the late Vice-Admiral Ward. The deceased was killed by a lamentable accident: he was discovered lying speechless at the bottom of the area steps of a house in the Victoria-road, down which he had fallen during the darkness of the preceding night. His skull was fractured.

Aug. 15. At the Dardanelles, Turkey, aged 76, George Ward, esq., formerly Deputy Paymaster-General.

Nov. 23. At Kensington, aged 81, James Ward, esq., R.A., "the Paul Potter of the English School," and the oldest of the Royal Academicians. Mr. Ward began life as an engraver, in which art he obtained a first-rate reputation; and was verging on middle age before he became a painter. In the walk of art he had chosen he quickly attained great popularity, and it is said that while at the height of his success he earned his 50*l.*, sometimes 70*l.* a day by his portraits of horses and bulls. Nor was he unsuccessful in a more ambitious walk, for he painted a large picture, "The Triumph of the Duke of Wellington," with Haydon and Hilton for competitors, and was successful. The picture is now in the hall of Chelsea Hospital. The particular picture which earned for him the title of "the English Paul Potter" is one called "The Bull,"—certainly a marvel of bovine portraiture. It is to be seen in the Picture Gallery of the Crystal Palace. Another of his fine pictures is in the Vernon Collection of the National Gallery, "A Scene in Lord de Tabley's Park." It must not by any means be supposed that Mr. Ward's pictures—certainly not his late ones—were mere representations of animals and nothing else: they frequently embodied scenes of dramatic interest or fun, or scenery, in which, however, the animal life was always the leading idea. Mr. Ward was a man of gentle manners, of conspicuous personal accomplishments, and of profound piety. He was, in other respects than age, the patriarch of painters. He was brother-in-law of Morland; father-in-law of Jackson; father of George Raphael Ward, the engraver; uncle of William Ward, the engraver; and grandfather of Mrs. Edward M. Ward, a most accomplished female artist.

May 25. At his residence, Park Mount, Macclesfield, aged 61, Henry Wardle, esq., a magistrate of the county of Chester and of the borough of Macclesfield.

Dec. 16. At Carobane, Tipperary, Sir H. Warren, eldest and only surviving son of the late Col. Sir J. Brooke, of the Twentieth Regiment.

Jan. 9. At his house, Manchester-square, Col. Thornhill Warrington.

March 29. At Corbally, near Carrick-on-Suir, aged 48, the most noble Henry de la Poer-Beresford, Marquess of Waterford, Earl of Tyrone, Viscount Tyrone, Baron de la Poer, of Curraghmore, co. Waterford, and Baron Beresford, co. Cavan, in the peerage of Ireland, and Baron Tyrone, of Haverfordwest, of the United Kingdom.

The noble lord, in his youth, obtained an unenviable notoriety for his "eccentricities;" but marrying, in 1842, Louisa, daughter of the late Lord Stuart de Rothesay, his lordship has since resided on his princely estates in Ireland, and was one of the best landlords and most improving cultivators in that country, and had become universally popular and respected. His lordship was accidentally killed while hunting, and, having no issue, is succeeded by his brother, in holy orders.

March 10. At Windermere, aged 78, Elizabeth, eldest surviving daughter of Richard Watson, D.D., late Bishop of Llandaff.

Jan. 21. At St. Thomas's Hospital, from the effects of a severe accident, aged 55, the Rev. John Watson, Principal of Hackney College. The rev. gentleman was knocked down by an omnibus near the clock-tower at the foot of London Bridge, and sustained such severe injuries as caused his death. Mr. Watson was Theological Professor at the Congregational College at Hackney, where his death has occasioned a profound feeling of regret.

Dec. 2. At Malvern, aged 74, Vice-Adm. George E. Watts, O.B.

Sept. 21. At West Boldon House, Durham, John Twizell Wawn, esq., J.P., and late M.P. for South Shields.

Jan. 5. Aged 58, Benjamin Way, esq., of Denham-pl., Bucks.

May 11. At Falmouth, John Welsh, esq., F.R.S., Superintendent of Kew Observatory of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

Sept. 14. At St. James's Palace, aged 64, the Rev. Charles Wealey, D.D., Sub-Dean of Her Majesty's Chapels Royal,

DEATHS.

Chaplain at St. James's Palace, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Oct. 16. At Aphorpe House, Northamptonshire, aged 75, the Right Hon. John Fane, eleventh Earl of Westmoreland, and Baron Burghersh, G.C.B., G.C.H., a General in the army, and Colonel of the Fifty-sixth Regt.; a member of many foreign Orders.

The deceased Earl was only son of John, tenth Earl, by his first marriage with Sarah Anne, only daughter and heir of Mr. Robert Child, the opulent banker of Fleet-st. He married, on the 26th of June, 1811, Priscilla Anne Wellesley, youngest daughter of William Wellesley Pole, third Earl of Mornington, by whom he leaves issue.

The deceased Earl had eminently distinguished himself both in the military and diplomatic service of his country for a period extending over half a century. He entered the army as an ensign at the close of the year 1803, and became captain in the Twenty-third Welsh Fusiliers in May, 1805, when he was appointed aide-de-camp to Lieut.-Gen. Don on the expedition to Hanover. In 1806 and 1807 he served in Sicily as assistant-adjutant-general, and during his employment in the Mediterranean he accompanied Admiral Sir J. Duckworth's fleet, and was present at the passage of the Dardanelles and the destruction of the Turkish fleet off the Castles, the actions before Constantinople, at the island of Prota, and at the re-passage of the fleet through the Dardanelles. His lordship afterwards served in Egypt with the force under General Wauchop, as assistant-adjutant-general, and took part at the first storming of the town of Rosetta, in the retreat, and subsequently in the second attack and siege of that place with the force commanded by Major-General Sir W. Stewart. In 1808 he joined the army in Portugal as assistant-adjutant-general in the army commanded by Sir Arthur Wellesley, and was present at the battles of Roleia and Vimiera. In the following year he served as extra aide-de-camp to Lord Wellington, and was among the gallant men who shared the dangers and glories of Talavera. The year succeeding, 1810, he served with the Third Dragoon Guards in the campaign in Portugal, including the retreat to Torres Vedras, battle of Busaco, and advance to Santarém. In September, 1813, he proceeded to the head-quarters of the allied armies, under Prince Schwarzenberg, in

Germany, accredited as military commissioner. He served at the siege of Hunin-guen, and the campaign of 1814 in France, including the taking of Langres, and the battles of La Rothière and Brienne, capture of Troyes, affairs of Mormant and Nangis, in front of Bray, defence of Troyes when attacked by Buonaparte, the battle of Bar-sur-Aube, the subsequent affair upon the Barce, recapture of Troyes, battles of Arcis-sur-Aube and of Fere Champenoise, the advance upon, battle, and capture of Paris. In August, 1814, he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Florence, and served with the Austrian army in the campaign against Naples in 1815, including the battles of Tolentino and Maccrara, and signed, in conjunction with Field-Marshal Bianchi, the Convention of Caza Lanza, by which the kingdom of Naples was restored to its legitimate sovereign, Ferdinand. He was appointed a privy councillor in March, 1822, and in 1825 he went on a special mission to the Court of Naples to congratulate Francis I. on his accession to the throne as King of the Two Sicilies. When the late Sir Robert Peel came into office, in 1841, his lordship was selected by the Earl of Aberdeen, the Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, to succeed Lord W. Russell as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of Berlin. His lordship continued resident Minister to Prussia up to the spring of 1851, when his diplomatic talents were transferred to Vienna. During his residence at Berlin he had to discharge the delicate functions of mediator between the Danish and Prussian plenipotentiaries in the Schleswig-Holstein affair, and, after a tedious and protracted negotiation, signed with them the treaty of peace between Prussia and Denmark on July 2, 1850. It was during his residence as Minister to the Emperor of Austria that he displayed his judgment and talents as a diplomatist. As Minister from England he was unremittingly engaged in the difficult negotiations connected with the Turkish question. On Lord John Russell being sent to the Congress at Vienna in February, 1855, the late Earl was one of the special Plenipotentiaries at the conferences. In November of the same year he retired from his post of British Minister at the Court of Vienna on his well-merited diplomatic pension, and was succeeded by the Right Hon. Sir George Hamilton Seymour. The last service he was selected

DEATHS.

by his Sovereign to perform was in July, 1856, when he was appointed to convey Her Majesty's congratulations to the King of the Belgians on the 25th anniversary of his ascension to the throne of Belgium. His lordship attained the rank of General in 1854, and had received the war medal and four clasps for Roleia, Vimiera, Talavera, and Busaco.

April 25. At Paraiba, Brazil, aged 36, James Wetherell, esq., British Vice-Consul at that port.

April 25. Lucy, wife of Sir Trevor Wheler, bart., of Leamington Hastings, Warwickshire.

Aug. 7. At Eastbourne, aged 99, Mrs. Ann Wigney, relict of Wm. Wigney, esq., of Brighton, banker. She was born in 1759, and therefore, had she survived till the ensuing month, she would have completed her 100th year.

Dec. 13. At the Cape of Good Hope, aged 78, Sir John Wilde, late Chief Justice there, a brother of the late Lord Truro. He was formerly Judge Advocate of the colony of New South Wales, and in 1827 received the appointment of Chief Justice at the Cape. On the assembling of the first Cape Parliament, in 1854, he took his seat as President of the Legislative Council.

Sept. At Newstead Abbey, aged 72, Colonel Thomas Wildman.

Colonel Wildman was the lineal descendant of an ancient family long settled at Barking Goat, in the county of Lancaster, and was the son of Thomas Wildman, esq., of Lincoln's Inn, and Bacton Hall, Suffolk. Colonel Wildman entered the Ninth Lancers in 1808, but subsequently changed into the Seventh Hussars. He served in Spain, in that and the following year, under Sir John Moore, and was in the memorable retreat to Corunna. He subsequently participated in all the actions and affairs in which his regiment was engaged in the Peninsula in 1813 and 1814, and had the honour of being aide-de-camp to the Marquis of Anglesea at the battle of Waterloo, and was in immediate proximity to that gallant General when he lost his leg. After the peace of 1815, Colonel Wildman again returned to England, and was for many succeeding years a guest at the Duke of Wellington's annual banquet. In 1818 he purchased of Thomas Clawton, esq., the Abbey and estate of Newstead, for the sum of 95,000*l.* Mr. Clawton had, in 1815, purchased the same property of Lord Byron for 140,000*l.* Since Colonel

Wildman purchased the Abbey, he has expended large sums of money in judicious alterations and improvements, and proved himself a worthy owner of a place at once the pride of the forest of Sherwood, and the admiration of thousands who have by his courtesy been permitted to traverse its beautiful grounds, its spacious galleries, and venerable halls. He was appointed equerry to his Royal Highness the late Duke of Sussex, with whom he was on terms of the closest intimacy up to the period of his death. The Colonel held the office of Provincial Grand Master of the Freemasons for thirty-five years, and was highly esteemed for his many social qualities by the brethren of the various lodges. He was also a deputy-lieutenant for Nottinghamshire, and served as high-sheriff in 1821. For several years he was Colonel of the Sherwood Rangers. Colonel Wildman married, in 1816, a Swiss lady, but has left no issue; and the residence of the great poet is again offered for sale.

Nov. 3. At Windsor, Nova Scotia, aged 88, Sarah, relict of the Hon. Judge Wilkins, late of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

April 24. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, suddenly, aged 42, Louisa, wife of Capt. Wm. Douglas-Willan, late Royal Artillery, and only daughter of the late Colonel Sir Samuel Gordon Higgins, K.C.H.

Oct. 6. From a wound received in the assault of the Fort of Beyt, aged 20, Edward Tanqueray Willaume, esq., Ensign Sixth Regiment Bombay Native Infantry, second son of Thomas B. Tanqueray Willaume, esq., of Leinster-gardens, Hyde-park.

Sept. 15. At St. Leonards-on-Sea, aged 74, Edward Willbraham, esq., Q.C., of Horsley, Gloucestershire.

Nov. 28. In the Close, Salisbury, aged 90, Amy, relict of Colonel Sir Richard Williams, K.C.B.

Jan. 29. At the residence of his father, St. Edward's-sq., Romford, Essex, aged 25, George Savill Willson, esq., late Forty-fourth Regiment, only son of Colonel Willson, C.B., late Grenadier Guards.

Nov. 22. At Edinburgh, at an early age, Dr. George Wilson, the first Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh, and Regius Keeper of the Industrial Museum, to which offices he was appointed in 1853. Dr. Wilson was a most accomplished chemist; he was profoundly versed in all the physical sciences; he was an elegant scholar, and a graceful and imaginative lecturer and writer.

DEATHS.

Aug. 24. At Cork-abbey, Bray, aged 87, Colonel the Hon. E. Wingfield.

July 8. At Westoe, near South Shields, after a long illness, aged 94, Dr. Winterbottom, the father of the medical profession, his name appearing first in the new Medical Register.

Feb. 18. At Galatz, aged 31, Com. Chas. Arthur Wise, R.N., commanding H.M.S. *Weser*.

Nov. 27. At Boulogne-sur-Mer, William T. Wodehouse, esq., late of the first Royal Dragoons, eldest son of the Hon. and Rev. William Wodehouse, of Hingham, Norfolk.

Nov. 19. At Park-st., Grosvenor-sq., W., of China fever, age 36, Commander Armine Wodehouse, R.N., late of H.M.S. *Cormorant*.

Mar. 29. At Wood-hall, Essex, aged 68, Richard Birch Wolfe, esq., for many years an active magistrate and a deputy-lieut. for the above county.

Jan. 16. Aged 64, Lady Georgiana Mary Wolff. Her Ladyship was the sixth daughter of Horatio, second Earl of Orford, and married in 1827 the Rev. Joseph Wolff, a clergyman of Jewish origin, who distinguished himself as a Missionary to the Jews in Palestine.

June. 25. Aged 22, Hamilton Wolridge, Lieut. R.M., son of Major A. A. R. Wolridge, Chatham.

Jan. 17. At Rydal Mount, aged 90, Mrs. Wordsworth, widow of the late Poet Laureate.

The last thing that would have occurred to Mrs. Wordsworth would have been that her departure, or anything about her, would be publicly noticed amidst the events of a stirring time. Those who knew her well regarded her with as true a homage as they ever rendered to any member of the household, or to any personage of the remarkable group which will be for ever traditionally associated with the Lake district; but this reverence, genuine and hearty as it was, would not, in all eyes, be a sufficient reason for recording more than the fact of her death. It is her survivorship of such a group which constitutes an undisputed public interest in her decease. With her closes a remarkable scene in the history of the literature of our century. The well-known cottage, mount, and garden at Rydal will be regarded with other eyes when shut up or transferred to new occupants. With Mrs. Wordsworth an old world has passed away before the eyes of the inhabitants of the district, and a new

one succeeds, which may have its own delights, solemnities, honours, and graces, but which can never replace the familiar one that is gone. There was something mournful in the lingering of this aged lady—blind, deaf, and bereaved in her latter years; but she was not mournful any more than she was insensible. Age did not blunt her feelings, nor deaden her interest in the events of the day. It seems not so very long ago that she said that the worst of living in such a place (as the Lake district) was its making one unwilling to go;—it was too beautiful to let one be ready to leave it. Within a few years, the beloved daughter was gone; and then the aged husband, and then the son-in-law; and then the devoted friend and publisher, Mr. Moxon, who paid his duty occasionally by the side of her chair; then she became blind and deaf. Still her cheerfulness was indomitable. No doubt, she would in reality have been “willing to go” whenever called upon, throughout her long life; but she liked life to the end. By her disinterestedness of nature, by her fortitude of spirit, and her constitutional elasticity and activity, she was qualified for the honour of surviving her household—nursing and burying them, and bearing the bereavement which they were vicariously spared. She did it wisely, tenderly, bravely, and cheerfully, and she will be remembered accordingly by all who witnessed the spectacle.

It was by the accident (so to speak) of her early friendship with Wordsworth's sister that her life became involved with the poetic element, which her mind would hardly have sought for itself in another position. She was the incarnation of good sense, as applied to the concerns of the every-day world. In as far as her marriage and course of life tended to infuse a new elevation into her views of things, it was a blessing; and, on the other hand, in as far as it infected her with the spirit of exclusiveness which was the grand defect of the group in its own place, it was hurtful; but it was less an evil than an amusement, after all. It was a rather serious matter to hear the poet's denunciations of the railway, and to read his well-known sonnets on the desecration of the Lake region by the unhallowed presence of commonplace strangers; and it was truly painful to observe how the scornful and grudging mood spread among the young, who thought they were agreeing with Words-

K K

DEATHS.

worth in claiming the vales and lakes as a natural property for their enlightened selves. But it was so unlike Mrs. Wordsworth, with her kindly, cheery, generous turn, to say that a green field with but-tercups would answer all the purposes of Lancashire operatives, and that they did not know what to do with themselves when they came among the mountains, that the innocent insolence could do no harm.

Making allowance for prejudices, neither few nor small, but easily dissolved when reason and kindliness had opportunity to work, she was a truly wise woman, equal to all occasions of action, and supplying other persons' needs and deficiencies. Of her early sorrows, in the loss of two children and a beloved sister who was domesticated with the family, there are probably no living witnesses. It will never be forgotten by any one who saw it how the late dreary train of afflictions was met. For many years Wordsworth's sister Dorothy was a melancholy charge. Mrs. Wordsworth was wont to warn any rash enthusiasts for mountain-walking by the spectacle before them. The adoring sister would never fail her brother; and she destroyed her health, and then her reason, by exhausting walks, and wrong remedies for the consequences. During the long years of this devoted creature's helplessness she was tended with admirable cheerfulness and good sense. After the lingering illness of the Poet's only daughter, Mrs. Quillinan, the mother encountered the dreariest portion, probably, of her life. Her aged husband used to spend the long winter evenings in grief and tears—week after week, month after month. Neither of them had eyes for reading. He could not be comforted. She, who carried as tender a maternal heart as ever beat, had to bear her own grief and his too. She grew whiter and smaller, so as to be greatly changed in a few months; but this was the only expression of what she endured, and he did not discover it. When he, too, left her, it was seen how disinterested had been her trouble. When his trouble had ceased, she, too, was relieved. She followed his coffin to the sacred corner of Grasmere churchyard, where lay now all those who had once made her home. She joined the household guests on their return from the funeral, and made tea as usual. And this was the disinterested spirit which carried her through the last few years, till she had just reached the 90th. Even

then she had strength to combat the disease for many days. Several times she rallied and relapsed; and she was full of alacrity of mind and body as long as exertion of any kind was possible. There were many eager to render all duty and love—her two sons, nieces, and friends, and a whole sympathizing neighbourhood. But not one is left now of the eminent persons who rendered that cluster of valleys so eminent as it has been. Dr. Arnold went first in the vigour of his years. Southey died at Keswick, and Hartley Coleridge on the margin of Rydal Lake, and the Quillinans under the shadow of Loughrigg, and Professor Wilson disappeared from Elleray, and the aged Mrs. Fletcher from Lancrigg, and the three venerable Wordsworths from Rydal Mount.

The survivor of all the rest had a heart and a memory for the solemn last of everything. She was the one to inquire of about the last eagle in the district, the last pair of ravens in any crest of rocks, the last old dalesman in any improved spot, the last round of the last pedlar among hills where the broad white road has succeeded the green bridle-path. She knew the district during the period between its first recognition, though *Gray's Letters*, to its complete publicity in the age of railways. She saw, perhaps, the best of it. But she contributed to modernize and improve it, though the idea of doing so probably never occurred to her. There were great people before to give away Christmas bounties, and spoil their neighbours as the established almsgiving of the rich does spoil the labouring class, which ought to be above that kind of aid. Mrs. Wordsworth did infinitely more good in her own way, and without being aware. An example of comfortable thrift was a greater boon to the people round than money, clothes, meat, or fuel. The oldest residents have long borne witness that the homes of the neighbours have assumed a new character of order, and comfort, and wholesome economy, since the Poet's family lived at Rydal Mount. Finally, she who had noted so many last survivors was herself the last of a company more venerable than eagles, or ravens, or old-world yeomen, or antique customs. She would not in any case be the first forgotten. As it is, her honoured name will live for generations in the traditions of the valleys round. If she was studied as the Poet's wife, she came out so well from that investigation that she was contemplated for herself, and the image so

DEATHS.

received was her true monument. It will be better preserved in her old-fashioned neighbourhood than many monuments which make a greater show.

Mrs. Wordsworth, whose maiden name was Mary Hutchinson, was of a family residing at Penrith, was married to Wordsworth in 1803, and was left his widow in 1850.

Dec. 21. At Boulogne, aged 46, Mr. Edward Wright, the favourite comedian, of the Adelphi Theatre.

Jan. 21. At her residence, in the Close, Salisbury, aged 80, Miss Charlotte Wyndham, sister of the late William Wyndham, esq.

Aug. 9. Suddenly, at her residence, Hamilton-house, Southampton, aged 73, Maria Frances, widow of Charles Wyndham, esq., late of Donhead-hall, Wilts, and daughter of the late Sir William Heathcote, bart., of Hursley-park, Hants.

Jan. 6. At Thane-hill-cottage, Amroth, Pembrokeshire, aged 68, the Hon. Mary Yelverton, daughter of the second Viscount Avonmore, fifth granddaughter of the first Viscount Avonmore, Lord Chief Baron of Ireland.

April 19. At Calcutta, to which place

he had been sent a prisoner after his capture at Canton, the Chinese Commissioner Yeh. He retained to the last that stoicism which had marked his demeanour from the moment he fell into our power, and which must have been simply callous indifference to human suffering rather than the result of philosophy; for he had in the course of his governorship decapitated no fewer than 100,000 of his fellow-subjects—men, women, and children; he had held in hopeless confinement and torture untold thousands; tens of thousands had died in his gaols or expired under his tortures, and whole populations had perished by the sword, had died of misery and starvation, or committed suicide in despair, under his baleful rule. The deceased Commissioner is said to have been one of the most learned and accomplished of all the Chinese statesmen, according to the notions of that people. His corpse was sent to Canton for interment in the cemetery of his ancestors.

Aug. 23. At Lincluden-house, near Dumfries, the Hon. Patricia, eldest daughter of the late Lord Panmure, and relict of G. Young, esq., of Lincluden.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.

NAMES of the SIXTEEN PEERS elected for SCOTLAND for the Eighteenth Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Marquess of Tweeddale, knt.
Earl of Morton.
Earl of Caithness.
Earl of Home.
Earl of Strathmore.
Earl of Haddington.
Earl of Airlie.
Earl of Leven and Melville.

Earl of Selkirk.
Earl of Orkney.
Viscount Strathallan.
Lord Saltoun.
Lord Gray.
Lord Blantyre.
Lord Colville of Culross.
Lord Polwarth.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND.

NAMES of the TWENTY-EIGHT REPRESENTATIVE PEERS for IRELAND.
(Elected for Life.)

Marquess of Westmeath.
Earl of Lanesborough.
Earl of Charlemont, K.P., E.B.
Earl of Mount Cashell.
Earl of Portarlington.
Earl of Mayo.
Earl of Erne.
Earl of Desart.
Earl of Wicklow, K.P.
Earl of Lucan, K.C.B.
Earl of Belmore.
Earl of Bandon.
Earl of Rosse, K.P.
Earl of Bantry.

Viscount Dungannon.
Viscount De Vesci.
Viscount Lifford.
Viscount Bangor.
Viscount Doneraile.
Lord Blayney.
Lord Farnham, K.P.
Lord Kilmaine.
Lord Clonbrock.
Lord Crofton.
Lord Clarina.
Lord Castlemaine.
Lord Downes.
Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal.

FOUR IRISH REPRESENTATIVE PRELATES.

The Archbishop of Armagh.
The Bishop of Cashel.

The Bishop of Derry.
The Bishop of Limerick.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS

Returned from the respective Counties, Cities, Towns, and Boroughs, to serve in the *Eighteenth Parliament* of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; Writs returnable on the 31st May, 1859; with the unsuccessful Candidates, and the state of the Poll where the Election was contested.

* * The names of the unsuccessful Candidates are printed in *Italics*.

ENGLAND AND WALES.

496 *Members*.

Abingdon:—John Thomas Norris, 144;
J. G. B. Hudson, 119.

Andover:—Ald. Wm. Cubitt, 153; Hon. D.
F. Fortescue, 120; *R. W. Johnson*, 114.

Anglesey:—Sir R. B. W. Bulkeley, bart.

Arundel:—Lord Edward G. F. Howard.

Ashburton:—John Harvey Astell, 91;
George Moffatt, 90.

Ashton-un-Lyne:—Rt. Hon. T. M. Gibson.

Aylesbury:—T. Tyringham Bernard, 552;
T. F. C. V. Wentworth, 535; Samuel
George Smith, 535. (*Double return*).

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Banbury*:—Sir C. Ewurwicke Douglas, 235; *Bernhard Samuelson*, 199.
- Barnstable*:—Lieut. Col. John D. F. Davie, 348; George Potts, 266; *Sir George Stucley, bt.*, 210; *Sir Wm. Aug. Fraser*, 199.
- Bath*:—William Tite, 1349; Arthur Edwin Way, 1339; *Thomas Phinn*, 1194.
- Beaumaris*:—Hon. W. Owen Stanley.
- Bedfordshire*:—Col. Richard T. Gilpin, 2027; F. C. Hastings Russell, 1837; *Col. W. B. Higgins*, 1583.
- Bedford*:—Samuel Whitbread, 455; Maj. William Stuart, 449; *Capt. F. Polhill Turner*, 427; *Thomas Barnard*, 427.
- Berkshire*:—Hon. P. P. Bouverie, John Walter; *Capt. L. V. Vernon*.
- Berwick-on-Tweed*:—*Capt. Chas. William Gordon*, 366; *Ralph Anstruther Earle*, 348; *D. C. Marjoribanks*, 330; *John Stapleton*, 257.
- Beverley*:—Ralph Walters, 605; Major Hen. Edwards, 539; *J. R. Walker*, 439; *E. A. Glover*, 54.
- Bewdley*:—Sir T. E. Winnington, bart.
- Birmingham*:—William Scholefield, 4425; John Bright, 4282; *T. D. Acland*, 1544.
- Blackburn*:—William Hen. Hornby, 832; James Pilkington, 750; *John P. Murrugh*, 567.
- Bodmin*:—Hon. E. F. Leveson Gower, 215; *Dr. William Michell*, 198; *James Wyld*, 167.
- Bolton*:—*Capt. Wm. Gray*, Joseph Crook.
- Boston*:—Herbert Ingram, 621; Meaburn Staniland, 593; *J. H. Holthway*, 463.
- Bradford*:—Henry W. Wickham, 2076; Titus Salt, 1727; *Alfred Harris*, 1229.
- Brecknockshire*:—Major Hon. G. C. Morgan.
- Brecknock*:—Col. Lloyd V. Watkins.
- Bridgnorth*:—Henry Whitmore, John Pritchard.
- Bridgewater*:—Col. C. J. K. Tynte, 290; Alex. William Kinglake, 279; *Henry Padwick*, 230; *Henry Westropp*, 208.
- Bridport*:—Thomas Alex. Mitchell, 334; Kirkman D. Hodgson, 290; *H. Nugent Bankes*, 170.
- Brighton*:—Admiral Sir G. R. B. Pechell, bart., 2322; William Coningham, 2106; *Sir Alan N. McNab*, 1327.
- Bristol*:—Hon. F. H. F. Berkeley, 4432; Wm. H. Gore Langton, 4285; *F. W. Slade*, 4205.
- Buckinghamshire*:—Caledon George Du Pré; Rt. Hon. Benjamin Disraeli; Hon. W. G. Cavendish.
- Buckingham*:—Sir Harry Verney, bt., 193; John G. Hubbard, 196; *Hon. G. W. Barrington*, 147.
- Bury*:—Rt. Hon. Frederick Peel, 633; *Thomas Barnes*, 477.
- Bury St. Edmunds*:—Lord Alfred Hervey, 418; Joseph A. Hardcastle, 307; *Sir R. J. Buxton, bt.*, 284.
- Calne*:—Rt. Hon. Robert Lowe, 103; *Thomas Henley*, 35.
- Cambridgeshire*:—Edward Ball; Henry John Adeane; Hon. Eliot T. Yorke.
- Cambridge*:—Kenneth Macaulay, 753; Andrew Steuart, 750; *Hon. E. Twisleton*, 682; *Francis Mowatt*, 669.
- Cambridge University*:—Rt. Hon. S. H. Walpole; Charles Jasper Selwyn.
- Canterbury*:—Hon. H. B. Johnstone; Rt. Hon. Sir W. M. Somerville, bt.
- Cardiff, &c.*:—Lieut.-Col. J. F. D. C. Stuart.
- Cardiganshire*:—Lieut.-Col. Wm. T. R. Powell, 1070; *A. H. Saunders Davies*, 928.
- Cardigan, &c.*:—*Capt. Edward Lewis Pryse*.
- Carlisle*:—Rt. Hon. Sir J. R. G. Graham, bt., 538; Wilfrid Lawson, 516; *W. N. Hodgson*, 475.
- Carmarthenshire*:—D. Jones; David Pugh.
- Carmarthen*:—David Morris.
- Carnarvonshire*:—Hon. E. G. D. Pennant.
- Carnarvon, &c.*:—Charles Wynne, 379; *W. Bulkeley Hughes*, 326.
- Chatham*:—Maj.-Gen. Sir J. M. F. Smith, 712; *A. J. Otway*, 652.
- Cheltenham*:—Col. F. W. F. Berkeley, 922; *Charles Schreiber*, 910.
- Chester, North*:—George Cornwall Legh; Hon. Wilbraham Egerton.
- Chester, South*:—Sir P. de M. G. Egerton, bt.; John Tollemache.
- Chester*:—Earl Grosvenor, 1453; Philip S. Humberston, 1110; *Enoch G. Salisbury*, 708.
- Chichester*:—Humphry W. Freeiland, 300; Lord H. G. C. G. Lennox, 288; *John Abel Smith*, 282.
- Chippenham*:—William John Lysley; Richard Penruddocke Long.
- Christchurch*:—Rear-Adm. J. E. Walcott.
- Cirencester*:—Allen Alex. Bathurst, 273; Hon. Ashley G. J. Ponsonby, 190; *Brent Spencer Follett*, 182.
- Clitheroe*:—J. Turner Hopwood.
- Cockermouth*:—John Steel; Rt. Hon. Lord Naas.
- Colchester*:—Taverner John Miller, 651; Philip O. Papillon, 593; *John Gurdon Rebow*, 518.
- Cornwall, East*:—Thomas J. Agar Robartes; Nicholas Kendall.
- Cornwall, West*:—Richard Davey; John Saint Aubyn.

502 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Coventry*:—Rt. Hon. Edward Ellice, 3107; Sir Joseph Paxton, 2409; *Morgan Treherne*, 1928.
- Cricklade*:—Ambrose L. Goddard, 745; Lord Ashley, 743; *Sir J. Neeld*, bt., 712.
- Cumberland, East*:—Hon. Chas. W. G. Howard; William Marshall.
- Cumberland, West*:—Gen. Henry Wyndham; Capt. Henry Lowther.
- Dartmouth*:—H. W. H. Schenley, 123; *Sir Thomas Herbert*, 116.
- Denbighshire*:—Sir W. W. Wynn, bt.; Col. R. M. Biddulph.
- Denbigh, &c.*:—Townsend Mainwaring.
- Derbyshire, North*:—Lord G. H. Cavendish; William Pole Thornhill.
- Derbyshire, South*:—Thomas Wm. Evans, 3536; William Mundy, 3185; *Hon. A. H. Vernon*, 3184.
- Derby*:—Michael Thomas Bass, 1261; Samuel Beale, 902; Wm. M. James, 736; *Henry Raikes*, 648.
- Devizes*:—Capt. J. N. Gladstone, B.N., 172; Christopher Darby Griffith, 167; *S. Watson Taylor*, 148.
- Devonport*:—Rt. Hon. James Wilson, 1216; Sir T. Erskine Perry, 1198; *W. B. Ferrand*, 1075; *Archd. Peel*, 1039.
- Devonshire, North*:—J. Wentworth Buller; Hon. C. H. R. Trefusis.
- Devonshire, South*:—Lawrence Palk; Samuel T. Kekewich.
- Dorchester*:—Richard Brinsley Sheridan; Capt. Charles N. Sturt.
- Dorsetshire*:—Hon. W. H. B. Portman; Henry Gerard Sturt; Henry Ker Seymour.
- Dover*:—Rear-Adm. Sir H. J. Leeke, K.C.B., 931; William Nicol, 902; *Sir William Russell*, bt., 788; *R. Bernal Osborne*, 752.
- Droitwich*:—Rt. Hon. Sir John S. Parkinson, bt.
- Dudley*:—H. Brinsley Sheridan, 432; *Viscount Monck*, 361.
- Durham, North*:—Robert Duncombe Shafto; Lord Adolphus F. V. Tempest.
- Durham, South*:—Henry Pease; James Farrer.
- Durham*:—William Atherton; Rt. Hon. J. R. Mowbray.
- Essex, North*:—Rt. Hon. W. Beresford; Charles Du Cane.
- Essex, South*:—Thos. William Bramston, 2896; J. W. Perry Watlington, 2704; *R. B. W. Baker*, 2245.
- Evesham*:—Sir H. P. Willoughby, bt., 188; Edward Holland, 149; *E. Chadwick*, 19.
- Exeter*:—Edw. Divett; Richard Sommers Gard.
- Eye*:—Sir E. C. Kerrison, bt.
- Finsbury*:—Thomas S. Duncombe, 8538; Sir S. Morton Peto, bt., 8174; *William Cox*, 4556.
- Flintshire*:—Hon. T. E. M. L. Mostyn.
- Flint, &c.*:—Sir John Hanmer, bt.
- Frome*:—Lord Edward Thynne, 194; *Donald Nicoll*, 147.
- Gateshead*:—William Hutt.
- Glamorganshire*:—Chr. E. M. Talbot; Henry Hussey Vivian.
- Gloucestershire, East*:—Sir O. W. Codrington, bt.; Robert Stayner Holford.
- Gloucestershire, West*:—Lieut.-Col. R. N. F. Kingscote; John Rolt.
- Gloucester*:—William Philip Price, 807; Charles James Monk, 779; *Sir R. W. Carden*, 595.
- Grantham*:—William Earle Welby; Hon. F. J. Tollemache.
- Greenwich, &c.*:—Aldm. David Salomons, 3873; William Angerstein, 3520; *Montagu Chambers*, 1718; *Sir John H. Maxwell*, 1031.
- Grimsby, Great*:—Lord Worsley, 526; *William Colley Parker*, 51.
- Guildford*:—William Bovill; Guildford Onslow.
- Halifax*:—Rt. Hon. Sir C. Wood, bt.; Jas. Stansfeld.
- Hants, North*:—William W. B. Beach; George Sclater-Booth.
- Hants, South*:—Hon. Ralph H. Dutton; Sir Jervis C. Jervoise, bt.
- Harwich*:—Capt. H. J. W. Jervis, 156; Hon. Wm. F. Campbell, 155; *Hon. R. T. Rowley*, 152; *J. C. Marshman*, 144.
- Hastings*:—Frederick North, 613; Lord Harry George Vane, 561; *Patrick F. Robertson*, 436; *William A. L. Shadwell*, 246.
- Haverfordwest, &c.*:—John H. Philipps.
- Helston*:—John Jope Rogers, 158; *Chas. Trueman*, 128.
- Herefordshire*:—James King King; Lord Mont. W. Graham; Humphrey Francis Mildmay.
- Hereford*:—Col. H. M. Clifford; G. Clive.
- Hertfordshire*:—Sir E. G. E. L. B. Lytton, bt.; Christ. W. Giles Puller; Abel Smith.
- Hertford*:—Rt. Hon. W. F. Cowper; Sir W. M. T. Farquhar, bt.
- Honiton*:—Joseph Locke; A. D. R. W. B. Cochrane.
- Horsham*:—W. R. S. V. Fitzgerald.
- Huddersfield*:—Edward Aldam Leatham, 779; *Edward Akroyd*, 760.
- Huntingdonshire*:—Edw. Fellowes, 1404; Lord Robert Montagu, 1314; *J. M. Heathcote*, 1068.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Huntingdon* :—Rt. Hon. M. Gen. J. Peel; Thomas Baring.
- Hythe* :—Baron M. A. de Rothschild.
- Ipswich* :—J. Chevallier Cobbold, 918; Hugh Edward Adair, 864; *Henry John Selwyn*, 842; *John King*, 388.
- Kendal* :—George Carr Glyn.
- Kent, East* :—Sir Brook W. Bridges, bt.; William Deedes.
- Kent, West* :—Viscount Holmesdale, 3769; Sir Edmund Filmer, bt., 3684; *C. Wykeham Martin*, 3584; *James Whatman*, 3460.
- Kidderminster* :—Alfred Rhodes Bristow, 217; *J. W. Huddleston*, 208.
- Kingston-upon-Hull* :—James Clay, 2445; Joseph Hoare, 2269; *J. H. Lewis*, 1959.
- Knaresborough* :—Basil Thomas Woodd, 173; Thomas Collins, 140; *Harry S. Thompson*, 127.
- Lambeth* :—William Roupell; William Williams.
- Lancaster, North* :—Col. J. Wilson Patten; Marquis of Hartington.
- Lancaster, South* :—Hon. Alg. F. Egerton, 7470; William John Legh, 6983; *John Cheetham*, 6835; *J. P. Heywood*, 6763.
- Lancaster* :—William James Garnett, 660; Samuel Gregson, 641; *W. A. F. Saunders*, 609; *E. M. Fenwick*, 459.
- Launceston* :—Thomas C. Haliburton.
- Leeds* :—Edward Baines, 2343; George S. Beecroft, 2302; *W. E. Forster*, 2280.
- Leicestershire, North* :—Lord John J. R. Manners, 2220; Edward Bouchier Hartopp, 1954; *C. H. Frewen*, 1433.
- Leicestershire, South* :—Charles William Packe; Viscount Curzon.
- Leicester* :—John Biggs, 1584; Joseph William Noble, 1496; *William Unwin Heygate*, 1476; *John Dove Harris*, 1397.
- Leominster* :—Gathorne Hardy; Hon. C. S. B. Hanbury.
- Leves* :—Rt. Hon. H. FitzRoy, 339; Hon. Hen. W. B. Brand, 338; *R. P. Amphlett*, 200; *Sir Charles W. Blunt*, bt., 189.
- Lichfield* :—Lord Alfred H. Paget; Capt. Hon. A. H. A. Anson.
- Lincolnshire, North* :—James Banks Stanhope; Sir M. J. Cholmeley, bt.
- Lincolnshire, South* :—Rt. Hon. Sir J. Trollope, bt.; George Hussey Parke.
- Lincoln* :—Maj. G. T. W. Sibthorp, 740; George Fieschi Heneage, 658; *J. Hinde Palmer*, 629.
- Liskeard* :—Ralph William Grey, 164; *W. H. Pole Carew*, 160.
- Liverpool* :—Thomas Berry Horsfall; Jos. Christopher Ewart.
- London* :—Sir James Duke, bt.; Rt. Hon. Lord J. Russell; Robert Wygram Crawford; Baron L. N. de Rothschild.
- Ludlow* :—Col. Hon. P. E. Herbert; Beriah Botfield.
- Lyme Regis* :—Col. William Pinney, 116; *John Wright Treeby*, 115.
- Lymington* :—W. A. Mackinnon, Jun., 157; Sir John R. Carnac, bt., 140; *J. Bramley Moore*, 125.
- Lynn Regis* :—Lord Stanley; John Henry Gurney.
- Macclesfield* :—John Brocklehurst; Edwd. Christ. Egerton.
- Maidstone* :—William Lee, 776; Charles Buxton, 776; *J. Wardlaw*, 751; *E. Vernon Harcourt*, 749.
- Malton* :—George M. Warren Peacocke, 503; Thomas Sutton Western, 431; *Lieut.-Col. A. W. H. Meyrick*, 427.
- Malmesbury* :—Viscount Andover.
- Malton* :—Hon. C. W. W. Fitzwilliam; James Brown.
- Manchester* :—Thomas Bazley, 7545; Jas. Aspinall Turner, 7300; *Abel Heywood*, 5448; *Capt. Hon. J. Denman*, 5201.
- Marlborough* :—Lord R. A. C. B. Bruce; Henry B. Baring.
- Great Marlow* :—Lt.-Col. T. B. Williams, 229; Lt.-Col. B. W. Knox, 175; *John W. Probyn*, 120.
- Marylebone* :—Edwin John James, 5029; Rt. Hon. Sir B. Hall, bt., 4668; *Lord Stanley*, 1102.
- Merionethshire* :—William W. E. Wynne, 389; *David Williams*, 351.
- Merthyr Tydvil* :—Henry Austin Bruce, 800; *E. M. Elderton*, 106.
- Middlesex* :—Robt. Hanbury, 3678; Hon. G. H. C. Byng, 3618; *James Haig*, 1147.
- Midhurst* :—Wm. Townley Mitford.
- Monmouthshire* :—Chas. Oct. S. Morgan; Col. E. A. Somerset.
- Monmouth, &c.* :—Crawshay Bailey.
- Montgomeryshire* :—Lieut.-Col. H. W. W. Wynn.
- Montgomery, &c.* :—David Pugh.
- Morpeth* :—Rt. Hon. Sir George Grey, bt.
- Newark* :—Grosvenor Hodgkinson, 489; *J. Handley*, 435; *Earl of Lincoln*, 416.
- Newcastle-under-Lyme* :—Wm. Jackson; William Murray.
- Newcastle-on-Tyne* :—Rt. Hon. T. E. Headlam, 2688; George Ridley, 2679; *P. A. Taylor*, 462.
- Newport, Isle of Wight* :—Robert Wm. Kennard, 319; Philip Lybbe Powys, 312; *Robert Charles, jun.*, 228.
- Norfolk, East* :—Lieut.-Col. Hon. W. C. W. Coke; Edward Howes.

504 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Norfolk, West*:—Geo. W. P. Bentinck; Bampton Gurdon.
- Northallerton*:—Wm. Battie Wrightson, 138; Charles Henry Mills, 136.
- Northamptonshire, North*:—Lord Burghley, 1849; George Ward Hunt, 1831; Fitzpatrick H. Vernon, 1344.
- Northamptonshire, South*:—Rainald Knightley; Col. Henry Cartwright.
- Northampton*:—Charles Gilpin, 1151; Rt. Hon. R. V. Smith, 1143; James T. Mackenzie, 832; Richard Hart, 27.
- Northumberland, North*:—Lord Lovaine; Sir M. W. Ridley, bt.
- Northumberland, South*:—Wentworth B. Beaumont; Hon. Henry G. Liddell.
- Norwich*:—Viscount Bury, 2154; Henry William Schneider, 2138; Sir Samuel Bignold, 1966; C. M. Lushington, 1900.
- Nottinghamshire, North*:—Lord Robert R. P. Clinton; Rt. Hon. J. E. Denison.
- Nottinghamshire, South*:—Wm. Hodgson Barrow; Viscount Newark.
- Nottingham*:—Charles Paget, 2456; John Mellor, 2181; T. Bromley, 1836; Ernest Jones, 151.
- Oldham*:—William Johnson Fox, 1039; John Morgan Cobbett, 966; J. T. Hibbert, 955.
- Oxfordshire*:—Rt. Hon. J. W. Henley; Lieut.-Col. J. Sidney North; George G. V. Harcourt.
- Oxford*:—J. Haughton Langston; Rt. Hon. Edward Cardwell.
- Oxford University*:—Rt. Hon. William E. Gladstone; Sir William Heathcote, bt.
- Pembrokeshire*:—Viscount Emlyn.
- Pembroke, &c.*:—Sir John Owen, bt.
- Penryn and Falmouth*:—Thomas George Baring, 389; Samuel Gurney, 373; H. Gwyn, 324; J. F. Foster, 199.
- Peterborough*:—Thomas Hankey, 275; George Hammond Whalley, 253; J. H. L. Wingfield, 195; J. P. Wilde, 187.
- Petersfield*:—Rt. Hon. Sir W. G. H. Jolliffe, bt.
- Plymouth*:—Viscount Valletort, 1153; Robert Porrett Collier, 1086; James White, 964.
- Pontefract*:—R. Monckton Milnes, 497; Wm. Overend, 306; H. C. E. Childers, 296.
- Poole*:—G. Woodrooffe Franklin, 203; Henry D. Seymour, 193; William T. Haly, 143.
- Portsmouth*:—Sir J. D. H. Elphinstone, bt., 1640; Rt. Hon. Sir F. T. Baring, bt., 1574; Hon. T. C. Bruce, 1442; Rear-Adm. Sir H. Keppel, 1385.
- Preston*:—R. Assheton Cross, 1542; Chas. Pascoe Grenfell, 1258; J. Talbot Clifton, 1168.
- Radnorshire*:—Sir John B. Walsh, bt.
- New Radnor*:—Rt. Hon. Sir G. C. Lewis, bt.
- Reading*:—Francis Pigott, 761; Sir Hen. Singer Keating, 666; R. A. Benson, 544.
- Reigate*:—Hon. William J. Monson, 260; W. A. Wilkinson, 161.
- Retford, East*:—Visct. Galway; Francis J. S. Foljambe.
- Richmond*:—Henry Rich; Marmaduke Wyvill.
- Ripon*:—John Greenwood, 223; John Ashley Warre, 205; A. B. Richards, 31.
- Rochdale*:—Richard Cobden.
- Rochester*:—Philip W. Martin, 665; Serj. John A. Kinglake, 662; G. H. Money, 505; G. Mitchell, 493.
- Rutlandshire*:—Hon. Gerard J. Noel; Hon. G. H. Heathcote.
- Rye*:—William Alexander Mackinnon.
- Saint Ives*:—Henry Paull, 257; C. F. Giesler, 130.
- Salford*:—William Nath. Massey, 1919; H. Ashworth, 1787.
- Salisbury*:—Lieut.-Gen. E. P. Buckley, 370; Matthew Henry Marsh, 326; John Chapman, 262.
- Sandwich*:—E. H. Knatchbull Hugessen, 497; Lord Clarence E. Paget, 458; Sir Jas. Fergusson, bt., 404; W. D. Lewis, 328.
- Scarborough*:—Hon. Wm. Denison, 562; Sir J. V. B. Johnstone, bt., 540; John D. Dent, 428; George J. Cayley, 66.
- Shaftesbury*:—George Grenfell Glynn.
- Sheffield*:—John A. Roebuck; George Hadfield.
- South Shields*:—Robert Ingham, 506; J. T. Wawn, 300.
- Shoreham, New, &c.*:—Sir C. M. Burrell, bt.; Stephen Cave.
- Shrewsbury*:—Geo. Tomline; R. Aglionby Slaney.
- Shropshire, North*:—Hon. Rowland C. Hill; J. B. Ormsby Gore.
- Shropshire, South*:—Viscount Newport; Hon. Robert W. Clive.
- Somersetshire, East*:—Sir William Miles, bt.; Lieut.-Col. W. F. Knatchbull.
- Somersetshire, West*:—Charles Aaron Moody; Sir A. B. P. F. A. Hood, bt.
- Southampton*:—William Digby Seymour, 1331; B. McGhie Willcox, 1204; Thos. M. Weguelin, 1012.
- Southwark*:—Adm. Sir C. Napier, K.C.B., 4446; J. Locke, 4255; Apsley Pellatt, 2730.

- Staffordshire, North* :— Rt. Hon. C. B. Adderley ; Viscount Ingestre.
- Staffordshire, South* :— Henry J. W. H. Foley ; William Orme Foster.
- Stafford* :— John Ayshford Wise, 911 ; Thomas Salt, jun., 624 ; Alderman T. Sidney, 366 ; Henry R. Addison, 181.
- Stamford* :— Lord Robert A. T. G. Cecil ; Sir S. H. Northcote, bt.
- Stockport* :— James Kershaw, 769 ; John Benjamin Smith, 641 ; William Gibb, 594.
- Stoke-upon-Trent* :— John Lewis Ricardo, 1258 ; Ald. W. T. Copeland, 1074 ; Samuel Pope, 569.
- Stroud* :— George Poulett Scrope ; Rt. Hon. E. Horsman.
- Suffolk, East* :— Lord Henniker, 2677 ; Sir FitzRoy Kelly, 2517 ; Col. A. Shafto Adair, 1888.
- Suffolk, West* :— Earl Jermyn, 1958 ; Maj. Windsor Parker, 1378 ; Capt. Philip Bennet, 1301.
- Sunderland* :— Henry Fenwick, 1527 ; William Schaw Lindsay, 1292 ; George Hudson, 790.
- Surrey, East* :— Thomas Alcock, 2953 ; Hon. P. J. Locke King, 2926 ; Anthony Cleasby, 2050.
- Surrey, West* :— John Ivatt Briscoe ; Hen. Drummond.
- Sussex, East* :— John Geo. Dodson ; Visct. Pevensey.
- Sussex, West* :— Earl of March ; Capt. Hon. H. Wyndham.
- Swansea, &c.* :— Lewis L. Dillwyn.
- Tamworth* :— Sir Robert Peel, bt., 341 ; Viscount Raynham, 285 ; W. T. S. Daniel, 80.
- Taunton* :— Arthur Mills, 415 ; Rt. Hon. H. Labouchere, 388 ; G. C. Bentinck, 325 ; William Beadon, 255.
- Tavistock* :— Sir J. S. Trelawny, bt. ; Arthur J. E. Russell.
- Tewkesbury* :— Hon. Frederick Lygon ; James Martin.
- Thetford* :— Earl of Euston ; Alexander Hugh Baring.
- Thirsk* :— Sir W. P. Gallwey, bt.
- Tiverton* :— Viscount Palmerston ; Hon. George Denman.
- Totnes* :— Earl of Gifford, 180 ; Thomas Mills, 152 ; John Dunn, 135.
- Tower Hamlets* :— Acton Smea Ayrton ; Charles S. Butler.
- Truro* :— Montague Edward Smith, 303 ; Augustus Smith, 225 ; Capt. Hon. J. C. Vivian, 213.
- Tynemouth* :— Hugh Taylor.
- Wakefield* :— William Henry Leatham, 406 ; J. C. D. Charlesworth, 403.
- Wallingford* :— Richard Malins.
- Walsall* :— Charles Forster, 495 ; Charles Bagnall, 383.
- Wareham* :— John S. W. S. E. Drax.
- Warrington* :— Gilbert Greenall.
- Warwickshire, North* :— Charles N. Newdegate ; Richard Spooner.
- Warwickshire, South* :— Evelyn P. Shirley ; Sir Charles Mordaunt, bt.
- Warwick* :— George William J. Repton ; Edward Greaves.
- Wells* :— Rt. Hon. Sir W. G. Hayter, bt. ; Capt. H. H. Jolliffe.
- Wenlock* :— Rt. Hon. G. C. W. Forester ; Jas. Milnes Gaskell.
- Westbury* :— Sir Massey Lopes, bt.
- Westminster* :— Sir John V. Shelley, bt. ; Lieut.-Gen. Sir De Lacy Evans.
- Westmoreland* :— Hon. H. C. Lowther ; Earl of Bective.
- Weymouth and Melc. Regis* :— Robert Brookes, 341 ; Viscount Grey de Wilton, 340 ; Col. W. L. Freestun, 311 ; R. J. R. Campbell, 296.
- Whitby* :— Robert Stephenson.
- Whitehaven* :— George Lyall.
- Wigan* :— Col. Hon. Jas. Lindsay, 500 ; Henry Woods, 476 ; Francis S. Powell, 273.
- Wight, Isle of* :— Charles Cavendish Clifford, 756 ; Col. F. V. Harcourt, 694.
- Wiltshire, North* :— Walter Long ; Rt. Hon. J. H. H. S. Estcourt.
- Wiltshire, South* :— Rt. Hon. S. Herbert ; Lord Henry F. Thynne.
- Wilton* :— Edmund Antrobus.
- Winchester* :— Sir J. Buller East, bt., 403 ; John Bonham Carter, 348 ; T. Willis Fleming, 342 ; George Shaw Lefevre, 230.
- Windsor* :— William Vansittart, 352 ; Geo. William Hope, 269 ; Charles W. Grenfell, 246.
- Wolverhampton* :— Rt. Hon. C. P. Villiers ; Sir Richard Bethell.
- Woodstock* :— Lord A. S. Churchill.
- Worcestershire, East* :— J. Hodgetts H. Foley ; Hon. F. H. W. G. Calthorpe.
- Worcestershire, West* :— Frederick Winn Knight ; Viscount Elmley.
- Worcester* :— William Laslett ; Osman Ricardo.
- Wycombe* :— Sir G. H. Dashwood, bt. ; Martin Tucker Smith.
- Yarmouth* :— Sir E. H. K. Lacon, bt., 699 ; Sir H. Josiah Stracey, bt., 659 ; E. W. Watkin, 568 ; A. W. Young, 536.
- Yorkshire, North Riding* :— Edward S. Cayley ; Hon. W. E. Duncombe.

506 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Yorkshire, East Riding:—Lord Hotham;
Rear-Adm. Hon. A. Duncombe.
Yorkshire, West Riding:—Sir J. W.
Ramsden, bt., 15,978; Frank Crossley,
15,401; *Rt. Hon. J. A. S. Wortley*,
18,636.
York:—J. Proctor B. Westhead, 1875;
Col. John George Smyth, 1805; *Dr. A.*
Layard, 1706.

SCOTLAND—53 Members.

Aberdeenshire:—Lord Haddo.
Aberdeen:—Col. William Henry Sykes.
Argyllshire:—Alexander Struthers Finlay.
Ayrshire:—Lord Patrick James Henry
Crichton Stuart.
Ayr, Irvine, &c.:—Edward Henry J.
Craufurd.
Banffshire:—Major Lachlan D. Gordon
Duff.
Berwick:—David Robertson, 461; *Sir J.*
Marjoribanks, bt., 428.
Bute:—*Rt. Hon. David Mure*, 188; *J.*
Lamont, 129.
Caithness:—George Traill.
Clackman and Kinross:—Wm. Patrick
Adam.
Dumbar:—Patrick Boyle Smollett,
490; *William C. Bontine*, 399.
Dumfriesshire:—J. J. Hope Johnstone.
Dumfries, &c.:—William Ewart, 432;
Capt. Walker, 403.
Dundee:—Sir John Ogilvy, bt.
Edinburgh:—Earl of Dalkeith.
Edinburgh:—Adam Black; *Rt. Hon. J.*
Moncreiff.
Elgin and Nairnshire:—Major C. L. C.
Bruce.
Elgin, Banff, &c.:—Mountstuart E. G.
Duff.
Falkirk, &c.:—James Merry.
Fife:—J. H. Erskine Wemyss, 1087;
Lord Loughborough, 850.
Forfarshire:—Viscount Duncan.
Glasgow:—Walter Buchanan; Robert
Dalglish.
Greenock:—Alexander M. Dunlop.
Haddingtonshire:—Lord Elcho.
Haddington, &c.:—Sir H. R. F. Davie, bt.
Inverness-shire:—Henry James Baillie.
Inverness, &c.:—Alexander Matheson,
410; *A. Campbell*, 307.
Kilmarnock, &c.:—*Rt. Hon. E. P. Bou-*
verie.
Kincardineshire:—Gen. Hon. H. Arbuth-
nott.
Kirkcaldy:—Lieut.-Col. R. Ferguson, 812;
William V. Harcourt, 294.

Kirkcudbrightshire:—James Mackie.
Lanarkshire:—Sir T. E. Colebrooke, bt.
Leith, &c.:—William Miller, 204; *R. A.*
Macfie, 746.
Linlithgowshire:—Major W. Ferrier Ha-
milton.
Montrose, &c.:—William Edward Baxter.
Orkney and Shetland:—Fredk. Dundas.
Paisley:—Humphrey E. C. Ewing.
Peeblesshire:—Sir G. G. Montgomery, bt.
Perthshire:—William Stirling.
Perth:—Hon. Arthur F. Kinnaird.
Renfrewshire:—Sir M. R. S. Stewart, bt.
Ross and Cromarty:—Sir Jas. Matheson,
bart.
Roxburghshire:—Sir William Scott, bt.
Selkirk:—Allan E. Lockhart.
Saint Andrews, &c.:—Edward Ellice, jun.
Stirlingshire:—Peter Blackburn.
Stirling, &c.:—James Caird.
Sutherlandshire:—Marquess of Stafford.
Wick, &c.:—Samuel Laing.
Wigtonshire:—Sir Andrew Agnew, bt.
Wigton, &c.:—Sir William Dunbar, bt.

IRELAND—105 Members.

Antrim, County:—Lieut.-Col. T. H. Pa-
kenham; Maj.-Gen. Hon. G. F. Upton.
Armagh, County:—Sir William Verner,
bt.; Maxwell Charles Close.
Armagh:—Josh. W. M'G. Bond, 201;
Stearn Ball Miller, 187.
Athlone:—John Ennis, 117; *Robert*
Bayley, 74.
Brandon:—Lieut.-Col. Hon. W. S. Ber-
nard.
Belfast, County:—Sir H. M'Calmont
Cairns; Richard Davison.
Carlow, County:—Capt. W. B. McBun-
bury; Henry Bruen.
Carlow, Borough:—Sir J. E. E. D. Acton,
bt., 117; *John Alexander*, 103.
Carrickfergus:—Robert Torrens, 667;
William M'Mechan, 258.
Cashel:—John Lanigan, 91; *John Carlen*,
10; *C. H. Hempbill*, 8.
Cavan, County:—Lieut.-Col. J. P. Max-
well; Capt. Hon. H. Annesley.
Clare, County:—Col. C. M. Vandeleur,
3829; Lieut.-Col. Luke White, 2234;
Francis M. Calcutt, 1999.
Clonmel, County:—John Bagwell.
Coleraine, County:—John Boyd.
Cork, County:—Rickard Deasy; Vincent
Scully.
Cork City:—Fras. Bernard Beamish, 1288;
Wm. Trant Fagan, 1231; *Col. Andrew*
Wood, 1208; *Bancroft Carroll*, 1085.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Donegal, County*:—Thomas Conolly; Sir Edmund S. Hayes, bt.
- Down, County*:—Lord Arthur E. Hill; Lieut.-Col. William B. Forde.
- Downpatrick, County of Down*:—David Stuart Ker.
- Drogheda, County of Louth*:—James M'Cann, 308; Charles M. Middleton, 205; *William Kirtland*, 2.
- Dublin, County*:—James Hans Hamilton; Lieut.-Col. T. E. Taylor.
- Dublin, City*:—Sir Edward Grogan, bt., 4251; John Vance, 4224; *F. W. Brady*, 3976; *Alex. McCarthy*, 3881.
- Dublin University*:—Anthony Lefroy; Rt. Hon. J. Whiteside.
- Dundalk, County of Louth*:—George Bowyer.
- Dungannon, County of Tyrone*:—Major Hon. W. S. Knox.
- Dungarvan, County of Waterford*:—John Francis Maguire.
- Ennis, County of Clare*:—Rt. Hon. J. D. Fitzgerald.
- Enniskillen, County of Fermanagh*:—Hon. John L. Cole.
- Fermanagh, County*:—Capt. M. E. Archdall; Lieut.-Col. Hon. H. A. Cole.
- Galway, County*:—Sir T. J. Burke, bt., 2636; William Henry Gregory, 2435; *Lord Dunlo*, 1496.
- Galway, Borough*:—John Orrell Lever, 743; Lord Dunkellin, 603; *Colonel French*, 549.
- Kerry, County*:—Rt. Hon. H. A. Herbert; Rt. Hon. Viscount Castlerosse.
- Kildare, County*:—William H. F. Ogan; Rt. Hon. R. More O'Ferrall.
- Kilkenny, City*:—Hon. L. G. F. Agar-Ellis, 2488; Capt. John Greene, 1992; *George Henry Moore*, 1747; *Serj. Wm. Shee*, 1590.
- Kilkenny, City*:—Michael Sullivan, 286; *Matthew O'Donnell*, 210.
- King's County*:—John Pope Hennessy, 1301; Patrick O'Brien, 1293; *Loftus H. Bland*, 1216; *Tristram Kennedy*, 818.
- Kinsale, County*:—John Arnott, 79; *Capt. Fred Brine, R.E.*, 88.
- Leitrim, County*:—John Brady; William R. Ormsby Gore.
- Limerick, County*:—Rt. Hon. William Monsell, 4020; Lieut.-Col. Samuel A. Dickson, 2626; *E. J. Synan*, 2369.
- Limerick, City*:—Francis Wm. Russell, 1207; Major George Gavin, 903; *James Spraight*, 806.
- Lisburn, Counties Antrim and Down*:—Jonathan Richardson.
- Londonderry, County*:—Robert Peel Dawson, 2628; Sir F. W. Heygate, bt., 2468; *Samuel McC. Greer*, 1790.
- Londonderry, City*:—Sir R. A. Ferguson, bt.
- Longford, County*:—Col. Henry White; Col. Fulke S. Greville.
- Louth, County*:—Chichester S. Fortescue, 1379; Richard M. Bellew, 1208; *John McClintock*, 1138; *Fred J. Foster*, 23.
- Mallow, County of Cork*:—Robert Longfield, 68; Sir C. D. J. Norreys, bt., 55.
- Mayo, County*:—Roger W. H. Palmer; Lord John T. Browne.
- Meath, County*:—Mat. Elias Corbally; Edward MacEvoy.
- Monaghan, County*:—Col. Chas. P. Leslie; Sir George Forster, bt.
- New Ross, Counties of Kilkenny and Wexford*:—Charles Tottenham, 86; *Joseph N. McKenna*, 77.
- Newry, Counties of Armagh and Down*:—Peter Quinn, 250; *Fred. McBlain, LL.D.*, 197.
- Portarlington*:—Capt. L. S. W. D. Damer.
- Queen's County*:—Michael Dunne; Lieut.-Col. Francis P. Dunne.
- Roscommon, County*:—Col. Fitzst. French, 1950; Capt. Thomas Wm. Goff, 1585; *Edward K. Tenison*, 1324.
- Sligo, County*:—Sir R. G. Booth, bt.; Charles W. Cooper.
- Sligo, Borough*:—Rt. Hon. J. A. Wynne, 177; *John P. Somers*, 71; *Lucas A. Treston*, 3.
- Tipperary, County*:—The O'Donoghoe; Lawrence Waldron.
- Tralee*:—Capt. Daniel O'Connell.
- Tyrone, County*:—Rt. Hon. H. T. L. Cory; Lord Claud Hamilton.
- Waterford, County*:—John Esmonde; Hon. W. Cecil Talbot.
- Waterford, City*:—Michael Dobbryn Hassard, 536; John Aloysius Blake, 529; *Sir H. W. Barron, bt.*, 455.
- Westmeath, County*:—Sir R. G. A. Levinge, bt.; William Pollard Urquhart.
- Wexford, County*:—Patrick McMahon, 3906; John George, 3024; *John Hatchell*, 2810.
- Wexford, Borough*:—John Edward Redmond.
- Wicklow, County*:—William W. Fitzw. Hume; Lord Proby.
- Youghal, County of Cork*:—Isaac Butt, 128; *Col. J. R. Smythe*, 54.

508 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

COMPARATIVE CHANGES AT THE GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1847, 1852, 1857, and 1859.

	1847.	1852.	1857.	1859.
Members re-elected for the same places .	409	434	452	511
Do. do. by other Constituencies .	29	22	13	13
New Members, formerly in Parliament .	43	24	39	40
Do. not before in Parliament .	173	175	151	91
Members returned for two places	3	—	—	—
	657	655	655	655
Deduct Double Returns .	1	1	1	1
	656	654*	654	654

* St. Albans disfranchised, 1855.

(Vacher.)

The following Members were returned to Parliament, and were sworn at the table during the year (irrespective of the Members returned at the General Election, *which see*).

FEBRUARY.

Reigate :—Hon. Wm. John Monson.
Manchester :—Thomas Bazley, esq.
Herefordshire :—Lord William Graham.
Devon, Southern Division :—Samuel Tre-
hawke Kekewich, esq. Re-el.
Chester County, Northern Division :—
Wilbraham Egerton, esq. Re-el.
Guildford :—Guildford Onslow, esq.
Brecknockshire :—Godfrey Charles Mor-
gan, esq.
Linlithgow County :—Charles Baillie, esq.
Boston :—William Henry Adams, esq.
Re-el.
Banbury :—Bernhard Samuelson, esq.
Galway Town :—John Orrell Lever, esq.
Greenwich :—Alderman David Salomons.
Dublin University :—Right Hon. James
Whiteside.
Leominster :—Captain the Hon. Charles
Spencer Bateman Hanbury.
York County, West Riding :—Sir John
William Ramsden, bart.
Worcester Riding, Eastern Division :—
Hon. Frederick Henry William Gough
Calthorpe.
Marylebone :—Edwin John James, esq.

MARCH.

Midhurst :—John Hardy, esq.
Oxford University :—The Right Hon. Wm.
Ewart Gladstone. Re-el.

Bury St. Edmunds :—Lord Alfred Hervey.
Wilt, Northern Division :—Right Hon.
Thomas Henry Sutton Sotherton Est-
court. Re-el.
Tewkesbury :—The Hon. Frederick Lygon.
Re-el.
Sussex, Western Division :—Earl of
March. Re-el.
Northumberland, Northern Division :—
Right Hon. Lord Lovaine. Re-el.
Enniskillen :—The Hon. John Lowry
Cole.
Stirlingshire :—Peter Blackburn, esq. Re-
el.
Harwich :—Captain Henry Jervis White
Jervis.

JUNE.

Tiverton :—Right Hon. Viscount Pal-
merston. Re-el.
London :—Right Hon. Lord John Russell.
Re-el.
New Radnor :—Right Hon. Sir George
Cornwall Lewis, bart. Re-el.
Halifax :—Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood,
bart. Re-el.
Morpeth :—Right Hon. Sir George Grey,
bart. Re-el.
Ashton-under-Lyne :—Right Hon. Thos.
Milner Gibson. Re-el.
Oxford City :—Right Hon. Edw. Card-
well. Re-el.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

- Leves* :—Right Hon. Henry Fitzroy. *Northampton Borough* :—Right Hon. Lord Henley.
Calne :—Right Hon. Robert Lowe. Re-el. *Ennis* :—Right Hon. John David Fitzgerald. Re-el.
Devonport :—Right Hon. James Wilson. Re-el. *Kerry* :—Right Hon. Viscount Castlerosse. Re-el.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne :—Right Hon. Thos. Emerson Headlam. Re-el. *Lichfield* :—Lord Alfred Henry Paget. Re-el.
Wolverhampton :—Sir Richard Bethell. Re-el. *Marylebone* :—Right Hon. Lord Fermoy.
Reading :—Sir Henry Singer Keating. Re-el. *Gloucester County, Western Division* :—Lieut.-Col. Robert Nigel Fitzhardinge Kingscote. Re-el.
Wigtown District of Burghs :—Sir Wm. Dunbar, bart. Re-el. *Edinburgh City* :—Right Hon. James Moncreiff. Re-el.
Bedford Borough :—Samuel Whitbread, esq. Re-el. *Cork City* :—Francis Lyons, esq.
Sandwich :—Edward Hugessen Knatchbull-Hugessen. Re-el. *Cork County* :—Rickard Deasy, esq. Re-el.
Ashton-under-Lyne :—Right Hon. Thos. Milner Gibson. Re-el.
Wolverhampton :—Right Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers. Re-el.
Wicklow :—Right Hon. Lord Proby. Re-el.

JULY.

- Norwich* :—Right Hon. Viscount Bury. Re-el.
Wilts, Southern Division :—Right Hon. Sidney Herbert. Re-el.
Oxford University :—Right Hon. Wm. Ewart Gladstone. Re-el.
Clonmel :—John Bagwell, esq. Re-el.
Monmouth County :—Poulett George Henry Somerset, esq.

AUGUST.

- Devonport* :—Sir Michael Seymour.
Dartmouth :—John Dunne, esq.
Taunton :—George Cavendish Bentinck, esq.

H O N O U R S.

THE PEERAGE.

THE following PEERAGES have been conferred during the Year :—

The Right Hon. Charles John Canning, Viscount Canning, of the Peerage of the United Kingdom, to be Earl Canning.

The Right Hon. Archibald William Montgomery, Earl of Eglinton in Scotland, to be Earl of Winton in the Peerage of the United Kingdom.

George Wyndham, esq., of Petworth, co. Sussex, to be Baron Leconfield.

William Tatton Egerton, esq., of Tatton Park, co. Cheshire, to be Baron Egerton.

Sir Charles Morgan Robinson Morgan, bart., of Tredegar, co. Monmouth, to be Baron Tredegar.

The Right Hon. John Elphinstone, Baron Elphinstone in the Peerage of Scotland, to be Baron Elphinstone in the Peerage of the United Kingdom.

The Right Hon. Robert Vernon Smith, of Farming Woods, co. Northampton, to be Baron Lyveden.

The Right Hon Sir Benjamin Hall, bart., of Llanover Court, Monmouthshire, to be Baron Llanover.

The Right Hon. Henry Labouchere, of Overstowey, co. Gloucester, to be Baron Taunton.

BARONETCIES.

THE following Gentlemen have been raised to the dignity of a BARONET in the course of the Year :—

Samuel Cunard, esq., Bush Hill, Middlesex.

Philip Duncombe Pauncefort Duncombe, esq., Great Brickhill Manor, Bucks.

Edward Grogan, esq., Moyvore, Westmeath.

John Neeld, esq., Grittleton, Wilts.

Charles Nicholson, esq., M.D.

John Henry Greville Smyth, esq., Ashton Court, Somerset.

George Stucley Stucley, esq., Affeton Castle, and Hartland Abbey, Devon.

ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD.

THE following Noblemen and Gentlemen have received the several Degrees in the ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD during the Year :—

ORDER OF THE GARTER.

The Earl of Harrrowby }
Earl Granville } To be Knights.

ORDER OF THE THISTLE.

The Marquess of Ailsa to be a Knight.

ORDER OF ST. PATRICK.

The Marquess of Devonshire to be a Knight.

ORDER OF THE BATH.

To be Military Knights Grand Cross :—

Rear-Adm. Sir Michael Seymour.

General Sir Thomas McMahon, bart.

General Sir William M. Gomm.

General Sir Robert W. Gardiner.

To be Civil Knights Grand Cross :—

Earl Canning.

Lord Elphinstone.

The Earl of Malmesbury.

Right Hon. Sir J. Pakington, bart.

To be Military Knights Commanders :—

Maj.-Gen. Sir John Michel.
 Col. Sir Robert Walpole.
 Col. Sir George R. Barker.
 Col. Sir John Douglas.
 Sir John MacAndrew, M.D., Inspector-
 General of Hospitals.
 Gen. Sir Henry Wyndham.
 Lieut.-Gen. Sir John Aitchison.
 Col. David Edward Wood.
 Col. Sir Charles Shepherd Stuart.
 Maj.-Gen. Sir H. G. Roberts.
 Maj.-Gen. Sir Geo. C. Whitelock.

To be Civil Knights Commanders :—

Rear-Adm. Sir Alexander Milne.
 Right Hon. Sir John Young, bart.
 Rear-Adm. Sir Thomas Hastings.
 Col. Sir Joshua Jebb.
 Sir Henry B. E. Frere.
 Sir Robert Montgomery.

To be Military Companions :—

Maj. Henry Dyett Abbott.
 Francis Short Arnott, esq., Surgeon,
 M.D.
 Lieut.-Col. Edw. Samuel Blake.
 Lieut.-Col. Edw. Gascoigne Bulwer.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Dennistoun Campbell.
 Lieut.-Col. James D. Carmichael.
 Col. Samuel Tolfrey Christie.
 Lieut.-Col. John William Cox.
 Col. Maurice Griffin Dennis.
 Capt. Henry E. Edgell, R.N.
 Capt. Edward G. Fishbourne, R.N.
 Lieut.-Col. Richard Herbert Gall.
 Maj. James Robert Gibbon.
 Lieut.-Col. Julius Richard Glyn.
 Charles Alexander Gordon, esq., M.D.
 Capt. Geo. Sumner Hand, R.N.
 Col. Thomas William Hicks.
 Lieut.-Col. Edward Hocker, R.M.
 Lieut.-Col. William Hope.
 Lieut.-Col. T. I. W. Hungerford.
 James G. Inglis, esq. M.D.
 Francis W. Innes, esq., M.D., Deputy-
 Inspector of Hospitals.
 Joseph Jee, esq.
 Col. Thomas Lemon, R.M.

Col. John Liddell.
 Lieut.-Col. Thomas Lightfoot.
 Maj. John Granville Lightfoot.
 Col. Archibald Inglis Lockhart.
 Col. Henry Errington Longden.
 William Mackenzie, esq., M.D.
 Lieut.-Col. George Malcolm.
 Lieut.-Col. William Campbell Mollan.
 Rear-Adm. Geo. Rodney Mundy.
 Lieut.-Col. Lothian Nicholson.
 Capt. Sir F. W. E. Nicolson, bart., R.N.
 Lieut.-Col. Henry Wylie Norman.
 Lieut.-Col. William Adam Orr.
 Lieut.-Col. Conrad John Owen.
 Col. William Parke.
 Lieut.-Col. William Payn.
 Lieut.-Col. Robert Pratt.
 Lieut.-Col. Edward Price.
 Col. Julius Augustus Robert Raines.
 Col. George Henry Robertson.
 Lieut.-Col. Sir William Russell, bart.
 Lieut.-Col. Arthur Scudamore.
 Lieut.-Col. William Henry Seymour.
 Maj. William H. Simpson.
 Col. Michael William Smith.
 Lieut.-Col. Thomas Smith.
 Capt. Hon. Keith Stewart, R.N.
 Maj. John B. Thelwall.
 John G. C. Tice, esq., M.D., Deputy-
 Inspector of Hospitals.
 Lieut.-Col. Arthur Walsh, S.S.
 Lieut.-Col. John McN. Walter.
 Maj. Thomas Fourness Wilson.
 Maj. J. Dobree Woolcombe.

To be Civil Companions :—

Sir William George Armstrong.
 Sir William Arrindell.
 Lieut.-Col. George Balfour.
 Frederick Cleeve, esq.
 Dr. Adriano Dingli.
 John Edye, esq.
 William David Jeans, esq.
 Richard Charles Kirby, esq.
 Charles Joseph La Trobe, esq.
 Sir James B. Macaulay.
 Frederick Doveton Orme, esq.
 William Stevenson, esq.
 Major Rob. Lewis Taylor.
 Charles Lennox Wyke, esq.

KNIGHTS BACHELORS.

THE honour of a KNIGHT BACHELOR has been conferred on the following Gentlemen during the Year.

William George Armstrong, esq.
John Arnott, esq. (L.L.I.)
Joseph Arnould, esq.
William Arrindell, esq., C.B.
W. Byham, esq.
James Carter, esq.
Bryan Edwards, esq.
Brenton Halliburton, esq.

Edw. Hay Drummond Hay, esq.
Hugh Hill, esq.
John Melville, esq.
Barnes Peacock, esq.
Hercules Geo. Robinson, esq.
William Snagg, esq.
Stephenson Villiers Surtees, esq.
John Thomas, esq.

THE VICTORIA CROSS.

JANUARY 26.

The Queen has been graciously pleased to confirm the grant of the decoration of the Victoria Cross to the undermentioned Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Privates, on account of the acts of bravery recorded against their several names :—

Captain (now Brevet-Major) Clement Walker Heneage, Sergeant Joseph Ward, Farrier George Hollis, and Private John Pearson, 8th Hussars.

Selected for the Victoria Cross by their companions in the gallant charge made by a squadron of the regiment at Gwalior, on the 17th of June, 1858, when supported by a division of the Bombay Horse Artillery, and H.M.'s 95th Regiment, they routed the enemy, who were advancing against Brigadier Smith's position, charged through the rebel camp into two batteries, capturing and bringing into their camp two of the enemy's guns, under a heavy and converging fire from the fort and town.

FEBRUARY 1.

Lieutenant (now Commander) Young, late gunnery officer of H.M.S. *Shannon*, and William Hall, "Captain of the Foretop," of that vessel, Naval Brigade.

Recommended by the late Captain Peel for the Victoria Cross, for their gallant

conduct at a 24-pounder gun, brought up to the angle of the Shah Nujiff, at Lucknow, on the 16th of November, 1857.

APRIL 12.

Lieut. (now Captain) Thomas Bernard Hackett, 23rd Regiment.

For daring gallantry at Secundra Bagh, Lucknow, on the 18th of November, 1857, in having, with others, rescued a corporal of the 23rd Regiment, who was lying wounded and exposed to very heavy fire. Also for conspicuous bravery in having, under a heavy fire, ascended the roof and cut down the thatch of a bungalow, to prevent its being set on fire. This was a most important service at the time.

Private George Monger, 23rd Regiment.

For daring gallantry at Secundra Bagh, Lucknow, on the 18th of November, 1857, in having volunteered to accompany Lieutenant Hackett, whom he assisted in bringing in a corporal of the 23rd Regiment, who was lying wounded in an exposed position.

Colour-Sergeant Stewart M'Pherson, 78th Regiment.

For daring gallantry in the Lucknow Residency on the 26th of September, 1857, in having rescued, at great personal risk, a wounded private of his company, who was lying in a most exposed situation, under a very heavy fire. Colour-Sergeant

HONOURS.

M'Pherson was also distinguished on many occasions by his coolness and gallantry in action.

Drummer Thomas Flinn, 64th Regiment.

For conspicuous gallantry in the charge on the enemy's guns on the 28th of November, 1857, when, being himself wounded, he engaged in a hand-to-hand encounter two of the rebel artillerymen.

Captain George Alex. Renny, Bengal Horse Artillery.

Lieutenant-Colonel Farquhar, commanding the 1st Belooch Regiment, reports that he was in command of the troops stationed in the Delhi magazine, after its capture on the 16th September, 1857. Early in the forenoon of that day a vigorous attack was made on the post by the enemy, and was kept up with great violence for some time, without the slightest chance of success. Under cover of a heavy cross fire from the high houses on the right flank of the magazine, and from Selinghur and the Palace, the enemy advanced to the high wall of the magazine, and endeavoured to set fire to a thatched roof. The roof was partially set fire to, which was extinguished at the spot by a Sepoy of the Belooch Battalion, a soldier of the 61st Regiment having in vain attempted to do so. The roof having been again set on fire, Captain Renny with great gallantry mounted to the top of the wall of the magazine, and flung several shells with lighted fuzes into the midst of the enemy, which had an almost immediate effect, as the attack at once became feeble at that point, and soon after ceased there.

Ensign (now Lieutenant) Patrick Roddy, Bengal Army (Unattached).

Major-General Sir James Hope Grant, K.C.B., commanding Oude force, bears testimony to the gallant conduct of Lieutenant Roddy on several occasions. One instance is particularly mentioned. On the return from Kuthirga of the Kuppurthulla Contingent, on the 27th of September, 1858, this officer, when engaged with the enemy, charged a rebel (armed with a percussion musket), whom the cavalry were afraid to approach, as each time they attempted to do so the rebel knelt and covered his assailant. This, however, did not deter Lieutenant Roddy, who went boldly in, and, when within six yards, the rebel fired, killing Lieute-

VOL. CI.

nant Roddy's horse, and before he could get disengaged from the horse, the rebel attempted to cut him down. Lieutenant Roddy seized the rebel until he could get at his sword, when he ran the man through the body. The rebel turned out to be a soubadar of the late 8th Native Infantry—a powerful man, and a most determined character.

MAY 6.

Major Frederick Miller, Royal Artillery.—Date of act of bravery, 5th of November, 1854.

For having at the battle of Inkermann personally attacked three Russians, and, with the gunners of his division of the battery, prevented the Russians from doing mischief to the guns which they had surrounded. Part of a regiment of English infantry had previously retired through the battery in front of this body of Russians.

Lieutenant Thomas Adair Butler, 1st Bengal European Fusiliers.—Date of act of bravery, 9th of March, 1858.

"Of which success the skirmishers on the other side of the river were subsequently apprized by Lieutenant Butler, of the Bengal Fusiliers, who swam across the Goomtee, and, climbing the parapet, remained in that position for a considerable time, under a heavy fire of musketry until the work was occupied."—*Lieutenant-General Sir James Outram's Memorandum of Operations at the Siege of Lucknow.*

MAY 27.

Private Michael Murphy, Farrier, 2nd Battalion, Military Train.—Date of act of bravery, 15th of April, 1858.

For daring gallantry on the 15th of April, 1858, when engaged in the pursuit of Koer Singh's army from Azimghur, in having rescued Lieutenant Hamilton, Adjutant of the 3rd Sikh Cavalry, who was wounded, dismounted, and surrounded by the enemy. Farrier Murphy cut down several men, and, although himself severely wounded, he never left Lieutenant Hamilton's side until support arrived.

L L

Lance-Corporal Alex. Thompson, 42nd Regiment.—Date of act of bravery, 15th of April, 1858.

For daring gallantry on the 15th of April, 1858, when at the attack of the fort of Ruhya, in having volunteered to assist Captain Groves, commanding the 4th Punjab Rifles, in bringing in the body of Lieutenant Willoughby, of that corps, from the top of the glacis, in a most exposed situation, under a heavy fire.

Quartermaster Sergeant John Simpson, 42nd Regiment.—Date of act of bravery, 15th of April, 1858.

For conspicuous bravery at the attack on the fort of Ruhya on the 15th of April, 1858, in having volunteered to go to an exposed point within 40 yards of the parapet of the fort, under a heavy fire, and brought in, first, Lieutenant Douglas, and afterwards a private soldier, both of whom were dangerously wounded.

Private James Davis, 42nd Regiment.—Date of act of bravery, 15th of April, 1858.

For conspicuous gallantry at the attack on the fort of Ruhya, when, with an advanced party, to point out the gate of the fort to the engineer officer, Private Davis offered to carry the body of Lieutenant Bramley, who was killed at this point, to the regiment. He performed this duty of danger and affection under the very walls of the fort.

MEMORANDUM.

Private Edward Spence, 42nd Regiment, would have been recommended to Her Majesty for the decoration of the Victoria Cross had he survived.

He and Lance-Corporal Thompson, of that regiment, volunteered, at the attack of the fort of Ruhya on the 15th of April, 1858, to assist Captain Cafe, commanding the 4th Punjab Rifles, in bringing in the body of Lieutenant Willoughby from the top of the glacis. Private Spence dauntlessly placed himself in an exposed position, so as to cover the party bearing away the body. He died on the 17th of the same month from the effects of the wound which he received on the occasion.

JUNE 18.

Lieutenant Francis Edward Henry Farquharson, 42nd Regiment.

For conspicuous bravery when engaged before Lucknow, on the 9th of March, 1858, in having led a portion of his company, stormed a bastion mounting two guns, and spiked the guns, by which the advanced position held during the night of the 9th of March was rendered secure from the fire of artillery. Lieutenant Farquharson was severely wounded while holding an advanced position, on the morning of the 10th of March.

Private Walter Cook and Private Duncan Millar, 42nd Regiment.

In the action at Maylah Ghaut, on the 15th of January, 1859, Brigadier-General Walpole reports that the conduct of Privates Cook and Millar deserve to be particularly pointed out. At the time the fight was the severest, and the few men of the 42nd Regiment were skirmishing so close to the enemy, who were in great numbers, that some of the men were wounded by sword-cuts, and the only officer with the 42nd was carried to the rear, severely wounded, and the colour-sergeant was killed, these soldiers went to the front, took a prominent part in directing the company, and displayed a courage, coolness, and discipline, which was the admiration of all who witnessed it.

Lieutenant William George Cubitt, 18th Bengal Native Infantry.

For having on the retreat from Chinhut, on the 30th of June, 1857, saved the lives of three men of the 32nd Regiment, at the risk of his own.

Lieutenant Hanson Chambers Taylor Jarrett, 26th Bengal Native Infantry.

For an act of daring bravery at the village of Baroun, on the 14th of October, 1858, on an occasion when about 70 Sepoys were defending themselves in a brick building, the only approach to which was up a very narrow street, in having called on the men of his regiment to follow him, when, backed by only some four men, he made a dash at the narrow entrance, where, though a shower of balls was poured upon him, he pushed his way up to the wall of the house, and beating

HONOURS.

up the bayonets of the rebels with his sword, endeavoured to get in. •

Private John M'Govern, 1st Bengal Fusiliers.

For gallant conduct during the operations before Delhi, but more especially on the 23rd of June, 1857, when he carried into camp a wounded comrade under a very heavy fire from the enemy's battery, at the risk of his own life.

JULY 6.

The Queen having been graciously pleased, by a warrant under Her Royal Sign Manual, bearing date the 13th of December, 1858, to declare that non-military persons who, as volunteers, have borne arms against the mutineers, both at Lucknow and elsewhere, during the late operations in India, shall be considered as eligible to receive the decoration of the Victoria Cross, subject to the rules and ordinances already made and ordained for the Government thereof, provided that it be established in any case that the person was serving under the orders of a General or other officer in command of troops in the field when he performed the act of bravery for which it is proposed to confer the decoration, Her Majesty has accordingly been pleased to signify her intention to confer this high distinction on the undermentioned gentlemen, whose claims to the same have been submitted for Her Majesty's approval, on account of acts of bravery performed by them in India, as recorded against their names, viz.:—

Mr. Thomas Henry Kavanagh, Assistant-Commissioner in Oude.

On the 8th of November, 1857, Mr. Kavanagh, then serving under the orders of Lieutenant-General Sir James Outram, in Lucknow, volunteered on the dangerous duty of proceeding through the city to the camp of the Commander-in-

Chief, for the purpose of guiding the relieving force to the beleaguered garrison in the Residency—a task which he performed with chivalrous gallantry and devotion.

Mr. Ross Lewis Mangles, of the Bengal Civil Service, Assistant Magistrate at Patna.

Mr. Mangles volunteered and served with the force, consisting of detachments of H.M.'s 10th and 37th Regiments, and some Native troops, despatched to the relief of Arrah in July, 1857, under the command of Captain Dunbar, of the 10th Regiment. The force fell into an ambush on the night of the 29th of July, 1857, and, during the retreat on the next morning, Mr. Mangles, with signal gallantry and generous self-devotion, and notwithstanding that he had himself been previously wounded, carried for several miles, out of action, a wounded soldier of H.M.'s 37th Regiment, after binding up his wounds under a murderous fire, which killed or wounded almost the whole detachment, and he bore him in safety to the boats.

SEPTEMBER 2.

Lieutenant (now Captain) Andrew Cathcart Bogle, 78th Regiment (now of the 2nd Battalion 13th Regiment).

For conspicuous gallantry on the 29th of July, 1857, in the attack at Oonao, in leading the way into a loop-holed house, strongly occupied by the enemy, from which a heavy fire harassed the advance of his regiment. Captain Bogle was severely wounded in this important service.

Private Henry Addison, 43rd Regiment.

For gallant conduct on the 2nd of January, 1859, near Kurrereah, in defending against a large force, and saving the life of Lieutenant Osborn, political agent, who had fallen on the ground wounded. Private Addison received two dangerous wounds and lost a leg in this gallant service.

OCTOBER 21.

Major Charles John Stanley Gough, 5th Bengal European Cavalry.—Date of acts of bravery, L L 2

HONOURS.

15th and 18th of August, 1857, and 27th of January, and 23rd of February, 1858.

1. For gallantry in an affair at Khurkowdah, near Rhotuck, on the 15th of August, 1857, in which he saved his brother, who was wounded, and killed two of the enemy. 2. For gallantry on the 18th of August, when he led a troop of the Guide Cavalry in a charge, and cut down two of the enemy's sowars, with one of whom he had a desperate hand-to-hand combat. 3. For gallantry on the 27th of January, 1858, at Shumshabad, where in a charge he attacked one of the enemy's leaders and pierced him with his sword, which was carried out of his hand in the *melée*. He defended himself with his revolver and shot two of the enemy. 4. For gallantry on the 23rd of February, at Meangunge, where he came to the assistance of Brevet-Major O. H. St. George Anson, and killed his opponent, immediately afterwards cutting down another of the enemy in the same gallant manner.

Brevet-Captain Robert Haydon Shebbeare, 60th Bengal Native Infantry.—Date of act of bravery, 14th of September, 1857.

For distinguished gallantry at the head of the Guides with the 4th column of assault at Delhi, on the 14th of September, 1857, when, after twice charging beneath the wall of the loopholed Serai, it was found impossible, owing to the murderous fire, to attain the breach. Captain (then Lieutenant) Shebbeare endeavoured to re-organize the men, but one-third of the Europeans having fallen his efforts to do so failed. He then conducted the rear-guard of the retreat across the canal most successfully. He was most miraculously preserved through the affair, but yet left the field with one bullet through his cheek, and a bad scalp wound along the back of the head from another.

Captain Herbert Mackworth Clogstoun, 19th Madras Native Infantry.—Date of act of bravery, 15th of January, 1859.

For conspicuous bravery in charging the rebels into Chichumbah with only eight men of his regiment (the 2nd Cavalry Hyderabad Contingent), compelling

them to re-enter the town, and finally to abandon their plunder. He was severely wounded himself, and lost seven out of the eight men who accompanied him.

Lieutenant Harry Hammon Lyster, 72nd Bengal Native Infantry.—Date of act of bravery, 23rd of May, 1858.

For gallantly charging and breaking, singly, a skirmishing square of the retreating rebel army from Calpee, and killing two or three Sepoys in the conflict. Major-General Sir Hugh Henry Rose, G.C.B., reports that this act of bravery was witnessed by himself and by Lieutenant-Colonel Gall, C.B., of the 14th Light Dragoons.

Lieutenant Harry North Dalrymple Prendergast, Madras Engineers. Date of acts of bravery, 21st of November, 1857, and other occasions.

For conspicuous bravery on the 21st of November, 1857, at Mundisore, in saving the life of Lieutenant G. Dew, 14th Light Dragoons, at the risk of his own, by attempting to cut down a Velaitee, who covered him (Lieutenant Dew) with his piece, from only a few paces to the rear. Lieutenant Prendergast was wounded in this affair by the discharge of the piece, and would probably have been cut down, had not the rebel been killed by Major Orr. He also distinguished himself by his gallantry in the actions at Ratgurrh and Betwa, when he was severely wounded.

Private Frederick Whirlpool, 3rd Bombay European Regiment.—Date of acts of bravery, 3rd of April and the 2nd of May, 1858.

For gallantly volunteering on the 3rd of April, 1858, in the attack of Jhansi, to return and carry away several killed and wounded, which he did twice under a very heavy fire from the wall; also for devoted bravery at the assault of Lohari on the 2nd of May, 1858, in rushing to the rescue of Lieutenant Doune, of the regiment, who was dangerously wounded. In this service Private Whirlpool received seventeen desperate wounds, one of which nearly severed his head from his body. The gallant example shown by this man is considered to have greatly contributed to the success of the day.

HONOURS.

MEMORANDUM.

Ensign Everard Aloysius Lisle Phillips, of the 11th Regiment of Bengal Native Infantry, would have been recommended to Her Majesty for the decoration of the Victoria Cross, had he survived, for many gallant deeds which he performed during the siege of Delhi, during which he was wounded three times. At the assault of that city he captured the Water Bastion with a small party of men, and was finally killed in the streets of Delhi on the 18th of September.

NOVEMBER 11.

Captain (now Brevet - Major) Henry Edward Jerome, 86th Regiment (now of the 19th Regiment).

For conspicuous gallantry at Jhansi on the 3rd of April, 1858, in having, with the assistance of Private Byrne, removed, under a very heavy fire, Lieutenant Sewell, of the 86th Regiment, who was severely wounded at a very exposed point of the attack upon the fort; also for gallant conduct at the capture of the Fort of Chandairee, the storming of Jhansi, and in action with a superior rebel force on the Jumna on the 28th of May, 1858, when he was severely wounded.

Lieutenant Aylmer Spicer Cameron, 72nd Regiment.

For conspicuous bravery on the 30th of March, 1858, at Kotah, in having headed a small party of men, and attacked a body of armed fanatic rebels, strongly posted in a loopholed house, with one narrow entrance. Lieutenant Cameron stormed the house, and killed three rebels in single combat. He was severely wounded, having lost half of one hand by a stroke from a tulwar.

Corporal Michael Sleavon, Royal Engineers.

For determined bravery at the attack of the fort of Jhansi on the 3rd of April, 1858, in maintaining his position at the head of a sap, and continuing the work under a heavy fire, with a cool and steady determination worthy of the highest praise.

Bombardier Joseph Brennan, Royal Artillery.

For marked gallantry at the assault of

Jhansi, on the 3rd of April, 1858, in bringing up two guns of the Hyderabad Contingent, manned by Natives, lying each under a heavy fire from the walls, and directing them so accurately as to compel the enemy to abandon his battery.

Private George Richardson, 34th Regiment, at Kewanie, Trans-Gogra, on the 27th of April, 1859.

For determined courage in having, although severely wounded—one arm being disabled, closed with and secured a rebel Sepoy armed with a loaded revolver.

Private Bernard M'Quirt, 95th Regiment.

For gallant conduct on the 6th of January, 1858, at the capture of the entrenched town of Rowa, when he was severely and dangerously wounded in a hand-to-hand fight with three men, of whom he killed one and wounded another. He received five sabre cuts and a musket shot in this service.

Private James Byrne, 86th Regiment.

For gallant conduct on the 3rd of April, 1858, at the attack on the fort of Jhansi, in carrying Lieutenant Sewell, who was lying badly wounded, to a place of safety, under a very heavy fire, assisted by Captain Jerome, in the performance of which act he was wounded by a sword cut.

Private George Rodgers, 71st Regiment.

For daring conduct at Marar, Gwalior, on the 16th of June, 1858, in attacking by himself a party of seven rebels, one of whom he killed. This was remarked as a valuable service, the party of rebels being well armed and strongly posted in the line of advance of a detachment of the 71st Regiment.

NOVEMBER 21.

Lieutenant (now Brevet-Major) Samuel Hill Lawrence, 32nd Regiment.

For distinguished bravery in a sortie on the 7th of July, 1857, made, as reported by Major Wilson, late Deputy-Assistant Adjutant-General of the Lucknow garrison, "for the purpose of examining a house strongly held by the

PROMOTIONS.

enemy, in order to discover whether or not a mine was being driven from it." Major Wilson states that he saw the attack, and was an eye-witness to the great personal gallantry of Major Lawrence on the occasion, he being the first person to mount the ladder, and enter the window of the house, in effecting which he had his pistol knocked out of his hand by one of the enemy; also for distinguished gallantry in a sortie on the 26th September, 1857, in charging with two of his men, in advance of his company, and capturing a 9-pounder gun.

Corporal William Oxenham, 32nd Regiment.—Date of act of bravery, 30th of June, 1857.

For distinguished gallantry in saving the life of Mr. Capper, of the Bengal Civil Service, by extricating him from the ruins of a verandah which had fallen

on him, Corporal Oxenham being for ten minutes exposed to a heavy fire while doing so.

Private William Dowling, 32nd Regiment.

For distinguished gallantry on the 4th of July, 1857, in going out with two other men, since dead, and spiking two of the enemy's guns. He killed a sonbahdar of the enemy by one of the guns. Also for distinguished gallantry on the 9th of the same month, in going out again with three men, since dead, to spike one of the enemy's guns. He had to retire, the spike being too small, but was exposed to the same danger. Also for distinguished bravery, on the 27th of September, 1857, in spiking an 18-pounder gun during a sortie, he being at the same time under a most heavy fire from the enemy.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

JANUARY.

Mr. Couch to be Recorder of Bedford.

Mr. James P. Peake, Assistant Master Shipwright, to be Master Shipwright at Devonport Dockyard.

Mr. Henry Craddock, Assistant Master Shipwright, to be Master Shipwright at Pembroke Dockyard.

Mr. William Henwood, First Assistant Master Shipwright, to be Master Shipwright at Sheerness.

Mr. Thomas Middleton Rennards, to be Stipendiary Magistrate for the Island of Mauritius.

Mr. George Dundas, M.P., to be Lieut.-Governor of Prince Edward's Island.

Dr. Thomas Watson to be Physician Extraordinary to Her Majesty.

Mr. George Alexander Hamilton to be Permanent Assistant Secretary to the Treasury.

Sir Charles Trevelyan, K.C.B., to be Governor of Madras.

Sir Stafford Northcote, bart., C.B., M.P., to be Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

Mr. W. H. Adams, of the Midland Circuit, to be Recorder for the Borough of Derby.

Mr. Edward Walter Bonham, to be Consul at Naples.

Colonel Henry Marion Durand, C.B., to be a Member of the Council of India.

Sir Walter Buchanan Riddell, bart., Recorder of Maidstone and Tenterden, to be County Court Judge of North Staffordshire, Circuit No. 26.

Mr. Robert Gilmour Colquhoun to be Agent and Consul-General in Egypt.

Mr. John Green to be Agent and Consul-General in Wallachia.

Mr. Rutherford Alcock to be Consul-General in Japan.

Mr. Daniel Brooke Robertson to be Consul at Canton.

Mr. Harry Smith Parkes to be Consul at Shanghai.

Mr. Walter Henry Medhurst to be Consul at Tangchow.

Mr. Thomas Taylor Meadows to be Consul at Newchwang.

Mr. Martin Crofton Morrison to be Consul at Foochowfoo.

Mr. William Rayment Gingell to be Consul at Amoy.

Mr. Charles A. Sinclair to be Consul at Chinkiang.

Mr. Frederick E. B. Harvey to be Consul at Ningpo.

PROMOTIONS.

Mr. George Whittingham Caine to be Consul at Swatow.

Mr. Edmund Hayes to be Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Ireland.

Mr. Francis Fitzgerald to be Baron of the Exchequer, Ireland.

The Right Hon. W. B. Gladstone to be Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands.

Captain the Hon. S. T. Carnegie, C.B., to be a Lord of the Admiralty.

Sir Matthew Sausse to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Bombay.

Mr. Arnould to be Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court, Bombay.

FEBRUARY.

Colonel Sir Henry K. Storks, K.C.B., to be Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands.

Major-General Sir Edward Lugard, K.C.B., to be Secretary for Military Correspondence.

Lieut. and Captain Frederick Charles Keppel, Grenadier Guards, to be Equerry to the Prince of Wales.

Colonel Charles William Ridley, C.B., Grenadier Guards, to be Gentleman Usher to the Prince Consort.

Mr. Higgins to be a Master in Lunacy.

Mr. W. Carmalt Scott, to be Registrar of the Court of Bankruptcy.

General Sir W. Codrington, K.C.B., to be Governor of Gibraltar.

Mr. Richard Weston Mara to be Attorney-General for the Island of Antigua.

Mr. A. F. Lutwyche to be Attorney-General of New South Wales.

Mr. Samuel Warren, Q.C., M.P., to be a Master in Lunacy.

Mr. Unthank to be a Master of the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Clifford Craufurd to be Secretary to the Court of Directors of the East India Company.

Captain Francis Howard Vyse to be Consul at Jeddo, in Japan.

Mr. Robert Alexander Osborne Dalzell, to be Consul at Erzeroom.

Mr. Alfred Septimus Walne to be Consul at Alexandria.

Lieut.-Colonel John Home Purves to be one of the Grooms of the Privy Chamber in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Sir William George Armstrong to be Engineer to the War Department for Rifled Ordnance.

MARCH.

Sir Robert N. C. Hamilton, bart., to be a Provisional Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India.

Mr. Beaumont Hotham to be Consul at Calais.

Mr. George Staunton Morrison to be Consul at Nagasaki, in Japan.

Mr. Christopher Pemberton Hodgson to be Consul at Hakodadi, in Japan.

Mr. George Hunter Cary to be Attorney-General for the Colony of British Columbia.

Mr. William White Cooper to be Surgeon-Oculist in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

The Judge Advocate and Mr. Robert Bayley Follett to be Commissioners under the Probate Acts.

The Rev. James George Currie Fussell to be an Inspector of Schools.

Mr. John Joseph Bennett to be Keeper of the Botanical Department in the British Museum.

Commander William E. Triscott to be Admiralty Superintendent of the Packet Service at Dover.

Mr. Thomas Fiott Hughes to be Oriental Secretary to the Embassy at Constantinople.

Mr. George Frederick Edmondstone to be Lieut.-Governor of the North-West Provinces, India.

Major-General Robert Henry Wynyard, C.B., to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Cape of Good Hope.

Mr. Samuel Mitchell to be Colonial Secretary for the Island of Grenada.

Mr. R. Temple to be Commissioner of Lahore Division, India.

Mr. R. Cust to be Commissioner of Umritsir Division, India.

Sir Hercules Robinson to be Governor of Hong Kong.

Sir C. Jackson to be a Member of the Council of India.

APRIL.

Mr. Thomas Fellowes Reade to be Consul at Tangier.

Mr. Miles Gerard Keon to be Colonial Secretary for the Bermudas, or Somers Islands.

Major-General Lord Hotham, Colonel Sir Alexander M. Tulloch, Colonel Sir William F. Forster, Colonel David Russell, Colonel John Thomas Leslie, C.B.,

PROMOTIONS.

Colonel John George Smyth, and Mr. Peter Blackburn, M.P., to be Commissioners to inquire into the present system of Recruiting in the Army.

Mr. John Milton to be Secretary to this Commission.

Mr. P. F. O'Malley, Q.C., to be Recorder of Norwich.

Mr. W. Carey Dobbs, M.P., to be Judge of the Landed Estates Court, Ireland.

Major-General Marcus John Slade to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Island of Guernsey.

Sir Barnes Peacock to be Chief Justice of Bengal.

Rear-Admiral Sir Henry J. Leeke, K.C.B., to be one of the Lords of the Admiralty.

Sir Henry Rawlinson, K.C.B., to be Minister to the Court of Persia.

Mr. Horace Young, to be Consul at Bilbao.

The Earl of Devon, Sir John Audrey, and Mr. Richard Jebb, to be Commissioners to inquire into the Administration of Justice in the Channel Islands.

Mr. E. Frankland to be Lecturer on Chemistry at the Royal Military College, Addiscombe.

Mr. A. Vance to be Law Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant.

Mr. James Robinson, Q.C., to be Chairman of the County of Roscommon.

The Right Hon. Charles Baillie to be Judge Ordinary of the Court of Session, Scotland.

Mr. David Muir to be Lord Advocate of Scotland.

Mr. Camille F. D. Caillard to be Judge of the County Court of Wiltshire.

Mr. George Patton to be Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Mr. William Henry Adams to be Attorney-General for the Colony of Hong-Kong.

MAY.

The Earl of Mansfield, K.T., to be Her Majesty's High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Sir George Ferguson Bowen, to be Governor of the new Colony of Queensland (district of Moreton Bay, New South Wales).

Sir Benjamin Pine to be Lieutenant-Governor of St. Christopher's.

Lieut.-General Sir William Codrington,

K.C.B., to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Gibraltar.

Colonel Mildmay to be Military Commissioner for Great Britain at the Headquarters of the Austrian Army at the seat of war.

Colonel Clermont to be Military Commissioner at the Headquarters of the French Army.

Colonel Cadogan to be Military Commissioner at the Headquarters of the Sardinian Army.

Mr. William Forsyth, Q.C., to be Standing Counsel to the Secretary of State in Council for India.

Mr. Thomas Ussher to be Chargé d'Affaires and Consul-General to the Republic of Hayti.

Mr. Henry Drummond Wolff to be Secretary to the Government of Corfu.

Mr. W. C. Humfrey to be Chief of the Army Medical Department in Ireland.

Mr. Arthur Edward Gayer, Q.C., to be an Ecclesiastical Commissioner for Ireland.

Mr. George Smyly, Q.C., to be Solicitor to the Board of Excise, Stamps, and Taxes, for Ireland.

Mr. C. Beadon to be Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

JUNE.

Mr. Sidney Herbert, M.P.; Major-Gen. Sir Robert John Hussey Vivian, K.C.B.; Col. Sir Proby Thomas Cautley, K.C.B.; Mr. Thomas Alexander, C.B.; Col. Edward Harris Greathead, C.B.; Dr. William Farr; Mr. James Ranald Martin; and Dr. John Sutherland; to be Her Majesty's Commissioners to inquire into, and report upon, the measures which it may be expedient to take for maintaining and improving the health of all ranks of Her Majesty's army serving in India.

Mr. Frederick Hamilton to be Secretary of Legation at Athens.

The Hon. William George Eden to be Secretary of Legation at Stuttgart.

Mr. Sidney Smith Saunders to be Consul at Alexandria, Egypt.

Mr. Henry Walter Overden to be Consul at Baltimore, United States.

Mr. Francis Macdonagh, Q.C., to be Counsel to the Excise Department for Ireland.

Mr. John Edward Walsh, Q.C.; to be Crown Prosecutor for the City of Dublin.

PROMOTIONS.

Mr. Henn to the Chairmanship of Carlow.

Sir Coleman O'Loughlin to the Chairmanship of Mayo.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy to the Chairmanship of Clare.

The Hon. Henry George Elliot, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the King of Denmark, has been appointed to proceed to Naples on a special mission to convey Her Majesty's congratulations to the King of the Two Sicilies on his Majesty's accession to the Throne.

Sir Arthur Charles Magenis, K.C.B., Envoy and Minister to the King of Sweden and Norway, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the King of the Two Sicilies.

Augustus Berkeley Paget, esq., Envoy and Minister to the King of Saxony, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the King of Sweden and Norway.

The Hon. Charles Augustus Murray, C.B., late Envoy and Minister to the Shah of Persia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the King of Saxony.

Mr. William Lowther to be Secretary to the Legation at Naples.

Mr. George Glynn Petre to be Secretary to the Legation at Hanover.

Major Andrew Cathcart to be Consul in Albania.

Mr. W. H. Bodkin, Q.C., Recorder of Dover, to be Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions Court.

Mr. Thomas Mostyn to be Solicitor to the Treasury in Ireland.

The Hon. John Peter Grant to be Lieut.-Governor of Bengal.

Col. Sir Richmond 'Shakespeare to be Agent to the Governor-General for Central India.

Major W. F. Eden to be Political Agent in Meywar.

Major R. L. Taylor to be Political Agent at Jeypore.

Major R. Morrison to be Political Agent at Harowtee.

Captain J. P. Nixon to be Political Agent at Joudhpore.

Major P. A. P. Bouverie to be Political Agent at Bhurtpore.

Captain A. R. E. Hutchinson to be Political Agent at Bhopal.

Mr. William A. Henry to be Solicitor-General for the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Henry Hasyard to be Colonial Secretary of Prince Edward's Island.

Mr. Geo. Wright to be Colonial Treasurer of Prince Edward's Island.

Dr. Guy, of King's College, London, to be Medical Superintendent of Milbank Penitentiary.

The Hon. William Stuart to be Secretary of Legation at Naples.

Mr. Edmund Gabriel to be Commissioner of the Mixed British and Portuguese Commission at Loanda.

Captain Sir Henry Vere Huntley, R.N., to be Arbitrator in the Mixed Commission at Loanda.

Mr. George Brand to be Consul at Lagos.

Mr. Charles Thomas Newton to be Consul at Rome.

Captain R. B. Watson, C.B., to be Captain Superintendent of Sheerness Dockyard.

Mr. Martin Curtler to be Treasurer of the County Courts of Herefordshire.

The Earl of Haddington to be a Commissioner to make provision for the better government and discipline of the Universities of Scotland, and improving and regulating the course of studies therein, and for the union of the two Universities and Colleges of Aberdeen.

Mr. William Forbes Mackenzie to be unpaid Commissioner and Chairman of the General Board of Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland.

Mr. Matthew Anderson to be Crown Solicitor for Dublin.

Mr. Claney to be Clerk of the Crown for the County of Sligo.

Mr. George Boden to be Recorder of Derby.

Mr. W. T. Maunsell to be Recorder of Stamford.

Mr. James Lawson to be Law Adviser to the Irish Government.

Captain Sandford Freeling, R.A., to be Colonial Secretary for the City and Garrison of Gibraltar.

Colonel George Abbas Kooli D'Arcy to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over Her Majesty's Settlements in the River Gambia.

The Hon. R. Montgomery to be Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab and Dependencies.

Mr. C. J. Wingfield to be Chief Commissioner of the Province of Oude.

Sir Barnes Peacock to be Vice-President of the Council of India for making Laws and Regulations.

Mr. A. Sconce to be a Member of the Legislative Council of India.

JULY.

The Earl of Caithness, Viscount Torrington, Lord Camoys, Lord Rivers, Lord De Tabley, Lord Cremorne, Lord Methuen, and Lord Byron, to be Lords in Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Lord Foley to be Captain of the Hon. Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms.

Earl Ducie to be Captain of the Yeomen of the Guards.

Lord Alfred Paget to be Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal to Her Majesty.

Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Nigel Fitzhardinge Kingscote, C.B., to be one of the Grooms-in-Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

The Earl Spencer to be Groom of the Stole, and Lord Waterpark Lord-in-Waiting to the Prince Consort.

Sir William Dunbar to be Keeper of the Privy Seal.

Mr. Serjeant Berwick to be Judge of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Court, Ireland.

Mr. Charles Barry to be Crown Prosecutor for the City and County of Dublin.

The Right Hon. Robert Lowe to be Fourth Charity Commissioner for England and Wales.

Sir George Cornewall Lewis to be an Ecclesiastical Commissioner for England.

Mr. John Robert Curtis to be Consul at Nantes.

Mr. Henry George Hughes, Q.C., to be a Baron of the Exchequer, Ireland.

Mr. C. K. Dove to be Postmaster-General of Bengal.

The Hon. Henry George Elliott to be Minister at Naples.

Augustus Berkeley Paget, esq., to be Minister at Copenhagen.

Frederick Hamilton, esq., to be Secretary of Legation, Frankfurt.

F. C. C. Norton, esq., to be Secretary of Legation, Athens.

Mr. Robert Andrews to be Chairman of Cork County.

Mr. R. N. Barron to be Chairman of Wexford County.

Mr. P. J. Blake to be Chairman of King's County.

The Hon. William George Grey to be Secretary of Embassy, Paris.

William Lowther, esq., to be Secretary of Legation, Berlin.

John Savile Lumley, esq., to be Secretary of Legation, St. Petersburg.

The Hon. Richard Edwards to be Secretary to the Legation at Madrid.

Mr. Henry Adrian Churchill, C.B., to be Agent and Consul-General in Moldavia.

Mr. Robert Segar to be Judge of the County Court for the Preston District.

Mr. Stamford Raffles to be Judge of the Court of Record for the Hundred of Salford.

Mr. Robert John Biron to be Recorder of Hythe.

Dr. James William Cusack to be Surgeon in Ordinary to Her Majesty in Ireland.

Mr. S. D. Birch to be Accountant-General, Bombay.

AUGUST.

John Porter Athill, esq., to be Chief Justice at St. Lucia.

Viscount Everley to be one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Sir Thomas Erskine Perry to be Member of Council for India.

Mr. D. Simson to be a Commissioner in Oude.

Mr. Allan Maclean Skinner, Q.C., to be Judge of the County Courts of Staffordshire.

Mr. T. Hastings Ingham to be Recorder of Clitheroe.

Mr. W. J. Neale to be Recorder of Walsall.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen to be Recorder of Newark.

The Hon. G. C. Vernon to be Recorder of Lincoln.

Mr. J. Hibbert Brewer to be Recorder of Northampton.

Mr. T. Goulburn to be Deputy Chairman of the Board of Customs.

Mr. Ralph William Grey, M.P., to be a Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. David Lynch to be Judge of the Court of Bankruptcy, Ireland.

Mr. Leahy, Q.C., to be Chairman of the County of Louth.

Mr. L. D. Birch to be President of the Mint Committee, and Governor-Director of the Bank of Bombay.

Mr. Charles Lennox Wyke, C.B., to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary on a Special Mission to the Republics of Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Honduras, and Salvador.

The Hon. William Gordon Cornwallis Eliot to be Secretary of Legation at Rio de Janeiro.

PROMOTIONS.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Cranworth, Lord Wensleydale, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Kingsdown, Sir John Romilly, Sir James Lewis Knight Bruce, Sir George James Turner, Sir William Page Wood, Sir Richard Bethell, Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns, Mr. George Markham Giffard, Q.C., Mr. William Strickland Cookson, and Mr. George Tallentire Gibson, to be Her Majesty's Commissioners to inquire into the mode of taking evidence in the Court of Chancery and its effects.

Mr. Christopher William Richmond to be Colonial Treasurer and Commissioner of Customs, New Zealand.

The Right Hon. E. P. Bouverie to be Second Church Estate Commissioner.

Serjeant Pigott, Mr. William H. Willes, and Mr. W. Slade, to be Commissioners to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices at the last election for Wakefield.

Mr. Edward L. Dew to be Secretary to the Commission.

Messrs. James Vaughan, L. H. Fitzgerald, and R. G. Welford, to be Commissioners to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices at the last election for Gloucester.

Mr. Charles Edward Coleridge to be Secretary to the Commission.

Viscount Dangan to be Military Secretary to the Governor of Bombay.

SEPTEMBER.

Charles Cunningham, esq., to be Consul at Galatz.

Major-General Sir Harry David Jones, Major-General Duncan Alexander Cameron, Rear-Admiral George Elliot, Major-General Sir Frederick Abbott, Captain Astley Cooper Key, R.N., Colonel John Henry Lefroy, and Mr. James Ferguson, to be Royal Commissioners to inquire into the State of the Defences of the United Kingdom, and especially of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards.

Major William Francis Drummond Jervois to be Secretary to the Commission:

Lord Ulick Brown to be Under Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

Robert George Wyndham Herbert, esq., to be Colonial Secretary, Queensland.

Richard Mills, esq., to be Accountant to the Treasury.

Colonel H. W. Trevelyan, C.B., to be Political Agent, Cutch.

Mr. William Dougal Christie to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Emperor of Brazil.

Dr. Antonio Micallef to be President of the Court of Appeal for the Island of Malta.

Dr. Salvator Naudi to be one of Her Majesty's Judges for Malta.

Edward Thornton, esq., to be Minister to Argentine Confederation.

William Garrow Lettsom, esq., to be Chargé d'Affaires and Consul-General, Republic of Uruguay.

Major R. Wallace to be Resident at Baroda.

Colonel O. Cavenagh to be Governor of Prince of Wales' Island, Singapore and Malacca.

Rear-Admiral the Hon. Sir Henry Koppel, K.C.B., to be one of Her Majesty's Grooms-in-Waiting.

Lieutenant-General Berkeley Drummond to be an Extra Groom-in-Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Mr. Henry J. Rae to be Clerk of the Crown for the County of Cavan.

OCTOBER.

Mr. E. H. Lushington to Officiate as Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

Captain H. R. James to be Commissioner and Superintendent of Peshawur Division.

Mr. John Henry Richards to be Chairman of the County of Waterford.

Captain Christopher Palmer Rigby to be Consul at Zanzibar.

Mr. R. P. Harrison to be Accountant-General to the Government of Madras.

Major C. Herbert to be Agent of the Governor-General with the King of Oude.

The Hon. William Gordon Cornwallis Eliot, to be Secretary of Legation at Athens.

Mr. John David Hay Hill to be Consul at Maranham.

Mr. Robert St. Aubin, R.N., to be Consul at Raiatea, in the Society Islands.

Mr. Rupert Kettle to be Judge of the Worcester County Court, No. 23 Circuit.

Major Travers to be Secretary for Kaffrarian Affairs.

Mr. F. Lushington to be Accountant to the Government of Bengal.

Mr. J. L. Lushington to be Accountant North West Provinces.

PROMOTIONS.

NOVEMBER.

Lieut.-Colonel George Ashley Maude, C.B., R.A., to be Crown Equerry, Secretary to the Master of the Horse, and Superintendent of the Royal Stables.

Colonel Clifford to be Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod.

Sir John Liddell, C.B., Dr. John Wilson, Dr. Alexander Nisbett, and Dr. Alexander Bryson, to be Honorary Physicians to Her Majesty.

Dr. Oliver Evans, Dr. John Grant Stewart, Dr. James Wingate Johnston, and Dr. Thomas Russell Dunn, to be Honorary Surgeons to Her Majesty.

Mr. George Cope Lewis Newnham to be Consul at Amsterdam.

Sir Arthur Charles Magenis, K.C.B., to be Minister at Lisbon.

The Hon. G. S. Stafford Jerningham to be Minister at Stockholm.

Mr. George John Robert Gordon to be Minister at Stuttgart.

Mr. Henry Francis Howard to be Minister at Hanover.

Mr. John Bary Dasent to be Judge of County Court Circuit, No. 40, Shoreditch, Bow, &c.

Mr. William Henry Willes to be Judge of the County Courts of Durham and Northumberland, Circuit No. 1.

Mr. George William Nicol to be Colonial Secretary and Accountant for the Colony of Sierra Leone.

Major-General Sir Henry John William

Bentinck, K.C.B., to be a Groom-in-Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

Mr. Robert Laurie to be Clarenceux King of Arms, and Principal Herald of the South-east and West parts of England.

DECEMBER.

The Duke of Bedford to be Lord Lieutenant of Bedfordshire.

Mr. Walter Aston Blount to be Norroy King of Arms and Principal Herald of the North Parts of England.

Major Esmonde to be Assistant Inspector-General of Constabulary (Ireland).

Mr. Edward Stephen Dendy to be Chester Herald.

Mr. Rutherford Alcock to be Envoy Extraordinary, Minister Plenipotentiary, and Consul-General in Japan.

Sir Henry Keating, knt., to be a Justice in the Court of Common Pleas.

Mr. William Atherton, Q.C., to be Solicitor-General.

Mr. Hamilton to be a Magistrate of the Marylebone Police Court.

Mr. John Smith Mansfield to be Magistrate of the Worship-street Police Court.

Mr. George Edward Adams to be Rouge Dragon Pursuivant of Arms.

Mr. David Fitzgerald to be Clerk of the Crown for the County of Tyrone (Ireland).

Mr. Robert P. Collier, Q.C., to be Counsel to the Admiralty, and Judge Advocate of the Fleet.

MILITARY AND NAVAL PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

THE easy access to the official Army and Navy Lists, which contain every information that can be required, renders the continuance of the imperfect abstract hitherto given in this work unnecessary. On the considerations that no one who wished for information on the subjects of Army and Navy Promotions or Appointments would look for it in the ANNUAL REGISTER, and that the abstract occupies space which may be advantageously devoted to other purposes, it has been determined to omit it for the future.

ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

JANUARY.

Rev. W. P. Hopton, Bishop's Frome, Hereford, to be a Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Hereford.

Rev. W. C. F. Webber to be Sub-Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.

FEBRUARY.

Rev. N. Bond to be a Prebendary in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury.

Rev. J. G. Bussell to be a Prebendary in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln.

Rev. T. Griffith to be a Minor Canon of Rochester Cathedral.

Rev. C. Hardwick, Fellow and Assistant Tutor of St. Catherine's College, and Christian Advocate, Cambridge, to be Archdeacon of Ely.

Rev. John Hughes to be Archdeacon of Cardigan in the Diocese of St. David's.

Rev. S. Flood Jones to be a Minor Canon of Westminster Abbey.

Rev. R. Sorsbie to be Precentor of the Cathedral Church of Rochester.

MARCH.

Rev. W. F. Hook, D.D., to be Dean of Chichester.

Hon. and Rev. C. L. Courtenay, Chaplain to Her Majesty, to be a Canon of St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Rev. J. H. Hamilton to be an Honorary Prebendary of St. Paul's.

Rev. W. H. Milman to be a Minor Canon in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Rev. J. C. Robertson to be a Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.

APRIL.

Rev. J. Downall to be Archdeacon of Totnes, in the diocese of Exeter.

Rev. G. F. Goddard to be Archdeacon of Rochester and a Canon of Rochester Cathedral.

Rev. G. A. Kissling to be Archdeacon of Waitemata, New Zealand.

Rev. T. Stanton to be a Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral.

Rev. P. Williams to be a Minor Canon in Chester Cathedral.

MAY.

Rev. A. Henderson to be Dean of Glasgow and Galloway.

Rev. W. C. Magee to be a Prebendary of Wells Cathedral.

Rev. T. B. Stuart to be a Prebendary of Wells Cathedral.

JUNE.

Ven. J. Colquhoun Campbell to be Lord Bishop of Bangor.

Rev. P. C. Claughton to be Bishop of St. Helena.

Rev. E. Wyndham Tuffnell to be Bishop of Brisbane, New South Wales.

Rev. H. Drury to be Chaplain to the House of Commons.

Rev. J. Murray Wilkins to be a Prebendary in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln.

Rev. J. W. Worthington, D.D., to be President of Sion College, London.

JULY.

Rev. Henry Lynch Blossie to be Archdeacon and Canon of Llandaff.

AUGUST.

Rev. T. Ainger to be a Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Rev. G. H. G. Anson to be an Honorary Canon in Manchester Cathedral.

Very Rev. D. Bagot, Dean of Dromore, to be Chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Rev. C. S. Bird, Prebendary of Lincoln, to be Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral.

Rev. T. F. Chamberlain to be an Honorary Canon in Manchester Cathedral.

Rev. R. P. Davies to be Archdeacon of Brecon, and a Cursal Prebendary of St. David's.

Rev. Charles Kingsley, Canon of Middleham, Yorkshire, and Rector of Eversley, Hants, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Rev. F. J. Rooke to be a Prebendary in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury.

Rev. W. Selwyn, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, and Canon

526 ANNUAL REGISTER, 1859.

PROMOTIONS.

of Ely, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Rev. W. Thomson, D.D., Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, and Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, London, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Rev. John Tullock to be Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty in Scotland.

SEPTEMBER.

Rev. T. Garnier to be Dean of Ripon.

OCTOBER.

Rev. R. B. Maurice Bonnor to be Dean of St. Asaph.

Rev. F. Tate to be a Prebendary in Exeter Cathedral.

NOVEMBER.

Rev. Markby J. T. Boys to be Archdeacon of Bombay.

Rev. Francis Garden to be Dean of the Chapels Royal, St. James's and Whitehall.

DECEMBER.

Rev. E. H. Beckles to be Bishop of Sierra Leone, Africa.

Rev. W. Basil Jones to be a Cursal Prebendary in St. David's Cathedral.

Rev. T. Mills to be an Honorary Canon in the Cathedral Church of Norwich.

Rev. John S. Utterton to be Archdeacon of Surrey, in the diocese of Winchester.

Rev. H. H. Swinny to be Principal of the Theological College at Cuddesdon, Oxford.

Mr. J. Saunders to be Professor of the English Language and Literature in the Presbyterial College, Bengal.

FEBRUARY.

Rev. J. J. Allen, of Balliol College, Oxford, to be Vice-Principal of Worcester Diocesan Training College, Saltley, Birmingham.

Rev. H. A. Barclay to be Sub-Master of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Ipswich, Suffolk.

Rev. J. R. Blakiston to be Head Master of Giggleswick Grammar School, Yorkshire.

Rev. Edmund Boger, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, to be Head Master of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, St. Saviour's, Southwark.

Rev. J. W. Caldicott, Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford, to be Master of the Grammar School, Preston, Lancashire.

Rev. E. Hawkins, to be Vice-Principal of Bishop's College, Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope.

Rev. C. Heath to be Vice-Principal of the Preparatory Military Academy, Eltham, Kent.

Rev. R. Mills Inskip to be Chaplain and First Naval Instructor of H.M.'s Training Ship, *Britannia*, for Naval Cadets at Portsmouth.

Rev. T. Humphreys L. Leary to be Master of the Grammar School, Derby.

Rev. R. N. Sanderson, of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, to be an Assistant Master in Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Ipswich, Suffolk.

Rev. E. W. Sergeant to be a Master at Wellington College.

Rev. J. Whiteside to be Head Master of the Endowed Grammar School, Kingsbridge, Devon.

MARCH.

Rev. H. Highton, Assistant Master of Rugby School, Warwickshire, to be Head Master of Cheltenham College.

Rev. T. J. Jones, to be Head Master of the Grammar School, Tideswell, Derbyshire.

Rev. J. Hirst Lupton to be Second Classical Master of the City of London School.

COLLEGIATE AND SCHOLASTIC APPOINTMENTS.

JANUARY.

Rev. Henry Martyn Crowther to be Sub-Master of the Grammar School of King Edward the Sixth, Norwich.

Rev. G. Pope to be Mathematical Master of the Grammar School, Norwich.

APRIL.

Rev. C. Collier to be Principal of the Training College, Winchester.

Rev. J. Mitchinson to be Head Master of the King's School, Canterbury.

Rev. J. J. Raven to be Master of the Grammar School, Bungay, Suffolk.

Rev. H. Walford to be Head Master of St. Nicholas College, Lancing, Sussex.

MAY.

Rev. W. Harrison Davey to be Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Cuddesdon, Oxfordshire.

Rev. H. P. Liddon, late Vice-Principal of the Cuddesdon Training College, to be Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Rev. F. Meyrick, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, to be an Assistant Inspector of Schools.

JUNE.

Rev. Augustus Jessopp to be Head Master of the Norwich Grammar School.

Rev. G. T. Tatham to be Head Master of the Preston Grammar School, Lancashire.

JULY.

Rev. Nevill Gream to be one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

Rev. Horatio J. Ward, Second Master at Westbourne College, Bayswater, London, to be Head Master of the Grammar School, Bridgnorth, Shropshire.

Dr. Harley to be Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in the University College, London.

Mr. William Pole to be Professor of Civil Engineering in the University College, London.

Baron von Streng to be Professor of Hindustani in the University College, London.

AUGUST.

Rev. T. Collins to be Second Master of the Grammar School, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Staffordshire.

Rev. H. Hayman, late Head Master of St. Olave's Grammar School, Southwark, to be Head Master of Cheltenham Grammar School.

Rev. H. G. Heaven to be Master of the Collegiate School, Taunton, Somerset.

Rev. A. Johnson to be Head Master of Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Southwark, Surrey.

Rev. J. R. Major to be Master of the Grammar School Maida-hill, Kilburn, Middlesex.

Rev. C. J. Robinson to be Assistant Government Inspector of Schools.

Rev. R. C. Scott to be Head Master of Ormskirk Grammar School, Lancashire.

Rev. Joseph Woolley, late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to be one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

SEPTEMBER.

Rev. F. Bancks Falkner to be Master of the Grammar School, Brackley, Northamptonshire.

Rev. Edwin Hatch, of Pembroke College, Oxford, to be Principal Classical Professor of the University of Toronto, Canada West, North America.

NOVEMBER.

Professor James C. Forbes to be Principal of the United Colleges of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, University of St. Andrew.

Mr. R. Grant to be Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow.

DECEMBER.

Rev. H. Montague Butler, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, to be Head Master of Harrow School, Middlesex.

PATENTS

Sealed from January 1st to December 31st, 1860.

. It is frequently difficult to make an abstract of the lengthy descriptions given by the patentees of their inventions, sufficiently short for the purposes of this list, and yet sufficiently accurate to indicate exactly the nature of the invention. It is hoped, however, that sufficient is given to afford to an inquirer the means of making more accurate researches in the official records.

-
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Abeillon, arching plane, Oct. 7 | Arnold, envelopes, May 27 |
| Adams, chain cable, June 17 | Arrott, soda, Nov. 29 |
| Adamson, propelling vessels, Sept. 15 | Arrowsmith, carding engines, Oct. 27 |
| Adamson, raising weights, Jan. 7 | Ash, cocks, Sept. 15 |
| Adcock, furnaces, May 30 | Ash, artificial teeth, Nov. 25 |
| Adie, measuring apparatus, April 1 | Ashcroft, hydraulics, Jan. 28 |
| Aerts, lubrication, Dec. 17 | Ashcroft, hydraulic machines, Oct. 13 |
| Agneri, decorating prints, July 1 | Ashton, air pumps, May 10 |
| Aimont, roads and ways, Aug. 2 | Ashton, gas regulators, Aug. 16 |
| Airey, spinning substances, Dec. 17 | Ashworth, power looms, April 18 |
| Aitchison, water-closets, Nov. 25 | Aspinall, evaporating, Aug. 31 |
| Aitchison, taps, Oct. 7 | Aspinall, bolts and rivets, July 5 |
| Aitken, looms, May 30 | Aspinall, refining sugar, April 8 |
| Alcan, paper, March 29 | Aston, propellers, May 27 |
| Alexander, bleaching fabrics, Jan. 28 | Aston, breech loading arms, Jan. 11 |
| Alexander, furnaces, April 29 | Auburtin, food, Sept. 29 |
| Alison, weeding instrument, June 24 | Auld, furnaces and boilers, Jan. 7 |
| Allan, steam boilers, April 16 | Auld, steam boilers, Oct. 19 |
| Allan, locomotives, Aug. 2 | Averill, mills, Jan. 21 |
| Allcraft, pressure gauges, Nov. 15 | Avery, screws, Sept. 15 |
| Allen, stereoscopes, July 29 | Ayerst, fire-arms, July 15 |
| Allen, propellers, May 6 | Bacon, valve-cocks, April 5 |
| Allen bedsteads, June 7 | Bagnall, iron, April 18 |
| Alexander, shears, Oct. 27 | Bagnicki, syringes, April 1 |
| Alleyne, iron beams, Nov. 25 | Bailey, combing wool, Jan. 28 |
| Alleyne, beams and girders, Feb. 25 | Bailey, loading fire-arms, March 18 |
| Allison, boring, Sept. 8 | Bailey, mining skips, Aug. 12 |
| Almond, furnaces, April 5 | Bailey, heating razors, May 14 |
| Allman, wire blinds, July 15 | Baillie, tanning hides, Dec. 23 |
| Ambler, fire-arms, July 26 | Baillie, railway wheels, May 21 |
| Amos, raising weights, May 24 | Baker, metallic lattice, Oct. 7 |
| Amos, pressure engines, July 1 | Baker, watches, Sept. 22 |
| Amos, raising vessels, Oct. 7 | Baker, fastenings, May 27 |
| Andrews, motive power, Feb. 25 | Bakewell, caustic alkalies, Dec. 2 |
| Angerstein, motive power, Nov. 4 | Bakewell, fireplaces, Sept. 29 |
| Angus, saddles, Oct. 19 | Bakewell, oils from minerals, Dec. 6 |
| Apperley, wheels, Dec. 20 | Balchin, projectiles, March 18 |
| Archer, steam boilers, April 1 | Bales, doors and sashes, March 18 |
| Archer, hat ventilators, May 14 | Ballaude, writing paper, Sept. 29 |
| Archibald, generating force, July 15 | Bamlett, reaping machines, Oct. 27 |
| Ardaseer, steam boilers, Nov. 8 | Banks, roadways, Sept. 15 |
| Arkell, telegraph cables, Jan. 11 | Banks, roadways, July 12 |
| Armstrong, drying timber, June 24 | Barber, knitted fabrics, Jan. 21 |
| Armstrong, ordnance, May 14 | Barchou, boots and shoes, Feb. 4 |

Barclay, electricity, June 10
 Barclay, steam hammers, Dec. 20
 Barclay, paper, Nov. 4
 Barclay, motive power, June 10
 Barlow, condensing steam, Aug. 16
 Barlow, beams and girders, Aug. 12
 Barnett, steam engines, Oct. 7
 Barnwell, umbrellas, Oct. 13
 Barrans, traction engines, July 13
 Barrow, cartridge boxes, March 8
 Barrow, treating gas, June 7
 Barroux, railroad, Dec. 9
 Barrow, fastenings, Oct. 7
 Barter, ventilating, July 19
 Basford, drying bricks, Aug. 12
 Basford, expressing clay, Oct. 27
 Bateson, generating steam, May 27
 Bateson, generating steam, March 22
 Batty, railway signals, July 15
 Baugh, raising metals, Dec. 13
 Baxter, painting, April 12
 Baylis, gas receivers, April 1
 Baylis, indicators, Aug. 2
 Bayliss, iron hurdles, Oct. 27
 Beadmore, steam boilers, May 20
 Beadon, boats and rafts, April 12
 Beale, colours for dyeing, Nov. 4
 Bean, stereoscope, April 21
 Beasley, sporting guns, March 18
 Beattie, locomotive engines, Oct. 13
 Beattie, locomotives, April 8
 Beaulieu, crinolines, Dec. 13
 Beck, stereoscopes, Dec. 6
 Beck, stoves, Oct. 13
 Bedborough, ventilating, July 1
 Bedells, elastic fabrics, Feb. 11
 Bedson, telegraph wire, Aug. 12
 Beliard, pumicing felts, May 20
 Bell, perforating, Jan. 28
 Bell, purifying gas, April 1
 Bell, preparing fabrics, Aug. 9.
 Bell, fusee, Sept. 29
 Bell, matches, Nov. 4
 Bell, manure, Nov. 29
 Bellanger, spring clogs, March 1
 Belleville, furnaces, Jan. 21
 Benda, models, April 12
 Bennett, cooling beer, Aug. 9
 Bennett, carding engines, Sept. 15
 Bennett, military capes, Jan. 11
 Bennetts, raising weights, July 12
 Benson, railways, April 18
 Bent, gas-meters, Oct. 27
 Bentall, turnip cutters, Jan. 28
 Bentall, grinding machine, July 5
 Benyon, weaving looms, May 3
 Benzon, steel, Jan. 14
 Benzon, aluminium, Jan. 25
 Bergue, electric cables, Jan. 14
 Bergue, telegraphic cables, Jan. 25
 Bernard, hydraulic pumps, Dec. 20

Bernard, boots and shoes, Dec. 30
 Bealey, covering metals, July 8
 Bessemer, iron and steel, April 1
 Bessemer, crank axles, Sept. 8.
 Bethell, treating pyrites, March 15
 Betjemann, book slides, Aug. 9
 Betts, capsules, June 14
 Bevan, calculating machine, May 27
 Bickerton, window sashes, Sept. 15
 Biers, wheel-break, June 28
 Birchley, cartridges, Mar. 18
 Bird, lubrication, Oct. 13
 Birkmyre, drying yarns, Nov. 15
 Bissell, railway trucks, April 29
 Black, motive power, Feb. 22
 Blackburn, traction engines, Nov. 29
 Blake, glass, Aug. 12
 Blake, kilns, Jan. 18
 Blake, sewing machine, June 14
 Blanche, block printing, Jan. 18
 Bleakley, railway signals, Mar. 1
 Blethyn, fuel, May 6
 Blumberg, billiard tables, May 3
 Blyth, treating hemp, April 18
 Boden, superheating steam, Sept. 29
 Bodmer, steam valves, Mar. 18
 Bodmer, children's toys, April 8
 Bodmer, steam boilers, Mar. 15
 Bodmer, resin, Mar. 25
 Bogg, washing machines, Dec. 20
 Boigeol, twisting fibres, Dec. 30
 Boissaneau, horse mill, May 12
 Boll, furnaces, July 29
 Booth, washing machine, Aug. 2
 Booth, ventilating, July 8
 Booth, winding cottons, May 24
 Booth, lace-tags, Aug. 31
 Bottomley, moreens, Jan. 25
 Bourne, separating metals, Oct. 27
 Bousfield, grinding, Oct. 27
 Bousfield, vulcanizable gums, Oct. 27
 Bousfield, making bread, Mar. 11
 Bousfield, cutting screws, Mar. 25
 Bousfield, paper bags, Mar. 18
 Bousfield, knitting machines, Feb. 11
 Bousfield, globes, May 10
 Bousfield, winding bobbins, Oct. 13
 Bovill, gas and fuel, Feb. 4
 Bow, fastenings, May 12
 Bow, pumps, May 30
 Bower, gas, Aug. 5
 Boyd, valves and cocks, June 7
 Boyd, candlesticks, June 10
 Boyle, umbrellas, June 24
 Brabazon, propellers, Feb. 11
 Bradbury, sewing machines, July 15
 Bradley, bricks and tiles, May 27
 Bramwell, raising ships, Oct. 7
 Bray, traction engines, June 24
 Brazil, indigo-blue dyeing, Feb. 25
 Brecknell, cocks and valves, April 8

M M

VOL. CI.

- Breeden, stop-cocks, April 18
 Breffit, hollow corks, Oct. 27
 Brennand, locomotion, May 12
 Brennand, ploughs, May 14
 Bridges, railway breaks, June 7
 Brierley, bedsteads, July 22
 Brierley, weaving looms, April 1
 Brierley, spinning, Jan. 28
 Bright, insulators, May 14
 Brignoles, rectifying alcohol, Aug. 22
 Brindley, rotary engine, July 26
 Brind, sewing machines, Mar. 1
 Britt, propellers, Mar. 25
 Brooks, propellers, May 10
 Brooks, locks, June 24
 Broom, steel, Feb. 18
 Brooman, wool fibres, Sept. 8
 Brooman, barley, Sept. 15
 Brooman, dyeing fibres, Aug. 16
 Brooman, caoutchouc, Oct. 19
 Brooman, telegraphing, May 6
 Brooman, printing shawls, Mar. 18
 Brooman, ladies' dresses, Mar. 1
 Brooman, embroidering, June 28
 Brooman, heating, Nov. 15
 Brooman, boiler stays, Aug. 31
 Brooman, silk thread, July 15
 Brooman, cooling wort, Aug. 2
 Brooman, candle moulds, Oct. 7
 Brooman, solidifying, Nov. 4
 Brooman, pumps, July 22
 Brooman, fire-arms, Nov. 4
 Brooman, electric signals, June 10
 Brooman, splitting hides, June 28
 Brooman, vessels for liquids, Mar. 1
 Brooman, twisting thread, June 10
 Brooman, plating, June 14
 Brooman, numbering machine, Mar. 1
 Brooman, cigar cases, May 24
 Brooman, washing machines, June 28
 Brooman, axles, Nov. 22
 Brooman, fire-arms, June 28
 Brooman, cleaning grain, Nov. 25
 Brooman, lace and net, May 14
 Brooman, red dyes, Oct. 7
 Brooman, gloves, June 2
 Brooman, engines, Oct. 27
 Brooman, fire-arms, Sept. 22
 Brooman, woollen cloth, Oct. 18
 Brooman, lithography, Dec. 23
 Brooman, treating gases, May 3
 Brooman, wire heddles, Jan. 11
 Brooman, sewing machines, July 26
 Brooman, axles and shafts, June 2
 Brooman, propelling vessels, April 5
 Brooman, cut pile fabrics, Mar. 22
 Brooman, knitting frames, Jan. 28
 Brough, dress fastenings, Mar. 1
 Brown, cartridges, April 1
 Brown, clog soles, Sept. 15
 Brown, buffers and springs, Oct. 27
 Brown, boots and shoes, June 24
 Brown, treating fibres, Aug. 2
 Brown, woollen fabrics, Aug. 31
 Brown, projectiles, April 1
 Brown, carding engines, Oct. 27
 Browne, railway switches, Sept. 22
 Bruce, agricultural drills, Nov. 22
 Bruce, paper, Aug. 9
 Brunon, cocks, April 21
 Bryant, lime, Oct. 7
 Buchanan, propellers, Jan. 5
 Buchanan, propellers, Feb. 25
 Buckingham, drawing fibres, Sept. 22
 Buckingham, drawing rollers, April 1
 Buckley, woven fabrics, Sept. 22
 Budd, tin plates, Nov. 18
 Bullough, looms, May 30
 Buncher, stair rods, April 1
 Bunting, breaks, May 12
 Burgess, rotary motion, June 28
 Burgess, reaping machines, May 3
 Burgh, steam engines, July 8
 Burnell, cure of ague, Nov. 22
 Burness, steam culture, Nov. 18
 Burness, forcing liquids, May 30
 Burrell, traction engines, Feb. 11
 Burrow, floor scrubber, Dec. 2
 Burrows, weaving looms, May 10
 Burrowes, pianofortes, June 7
 Burt, railway carriages, July 26
 Burt, timber, Sept. 22
 Burton, fire-arms, Dec. 6
 Burton, fire-arms, Sept. 29
 Bury, embossing, Nov. 29
 Bussey, cartridges, Oct. 13
 Butcher, pianofortes, May 10
 Caithness, Earl of, permanent way, Dec. 13
 Callebant, sewing machines, Jan. 23
 Calow, cage machinery, Sept. 8
 Calvert, size, Jan. 21
 Cambridge, thrashing, Oct. 18
 Cambridge, chain harrow, Aug. 31
 Cameron, treating sugar, May 21
 Campbell, nails, Oct. 13
 Campion, looped fabrics, Oct. 7
 Cannon, washing machines, Oct. 27
 Carey, railway plates, Jan. 28
 Cariss, switch box, April 29
 Carr, felted cloth, Nov. 29
 Carr, artificial manures, Sept. 8
 Carruthers, weaving, June 10
 Carter, sawing slate, Dec. 20
 Carter, crushing, Aug. 31
 Cartmel, head coverings, Feb. 11
 Cartwright, crushing, Sept. 29
 Casentini, plastic figures, Mar. 4
 Casper, seats and settles, June 28
 Castay, metallic bridges, Oct. 7
 Caton, weaving looms, Mar. 18
 Cattell, varnish, Nov. 29
 Cattell, gutta serena, Aug. 12

- Cetti, barometers, Jan. 11
 Chandler, ploughs, April 29
 Chantrell, charcoal, June 7
 Chantrell, charcoal, Aug. 5
 Chantrell, charcoal kilns, Nov. 22
 Chantrell, waterclosets, Sept. 29
 Chaplin, steam boilers, Oct. 7
 Chapman, knitting machines, Dec. 6
 Chapman, angle iron, July 26
 Chappuis, stereoscopes, Feb. 15
 Charlesworth, fire-arms, Nov. 15
 Chatterton, covering wires, Nov. 4
 Cheetham, spinning machine, Mar. 8
 Chesneau, paddle wheels, Dec. 6
 Chester, fire arms, Jan. 7
 Child, hairbrushes, Mar. 4
 Child, dyeing wool, June 20
 Child, table covers, Feb. 18
 Childs, night-light cases, Aug. 12
 Childs, india rubber, Oct. 27
 Childs, artificial teeth, June 28
 Chillingworth, high-pressure, Jan. 7
 Chrimes, wash-hand basins, Nov. 8
 Clarini, metal nails, Nov. 4
 Clark, tanning hides, May 3
 Clark, knitting machines, Oct. 13
 Clark, pressure gauges, Aug. 5
 Clark, sewing machinery, Oct. 13
 Clark, telegraph cables, Feb. 25
 Clark, organic alkalies, Oct. 27
 Clark, ships' blocks, July 5
 Clark, shutters and blinds, July 29
 Clark, purifying lime, Mar. 15
 Clark, electric cables, May 30
 Clark, advertising, May 6
 Clark, knobs and handles, June 20
 Clark, railway signals, May 3
 Clark, oats, Sept. 8
 Clark, india-rubber, Sept. 8
 Clark, peat, Sept. 8
 Clark, chemicals, May 14
 Clark, preserving grain, July 26
 Clark, seed depositors, Oct. 13
 Clark, railway signals, July 26
 Clark, separating metals, Oct. 7
 Clark, agriculture, May 30
 Clark, loading coal ships, Oct. 7
 Clark, ventilation of air, Oct. 27
 Clark, preserving wood, May 6
 Clark, tanning hides, April 1
 Clark, telegraphs, July 8
 Clark, electric lamps, Aug. 31
 Clark, hot air, Nov. 15
 Clark, water heating, Sept. 29
 Clarke, reels, Aug. 16
 Clarke, hauling pulleys, Oct. 27
 Clarke, core barrels, July 19
 Clarke, crossing cheques, April 18
 Clarke, millstones, Nov. 4
 Clarke, winding reels, Nov. 22
 Clarke, window blinds, Jan. 18
 Claxton, boots and shoes, Mar. 18
 Clay, vessels, Aug. 12
 Clay, harrows, Mar. 26
 Clayton, metallic pistons, Aug. 2
 Clegg, lubricators, Feb. 22
 Clegg, soap, Aug. 12
 Clegg, motive power, June 20
 Clegg, signals, July 8
 Clegg, screws, April 18
 Clements, curtain rings, May 6
 Clerk, cleavers, Dec. 23
 Cliff, kilns, May 3
 Clissold, rasping, Jan. 7
 Cloake, stopping wheels, Aug. 22
 Coates, printing, Jan. 28
 Cobbold, marking instrument, April 1.
 Cochran, fastenings, Feb. 22
 Cocker, steel and iron, April 18
 Cocker, doubling cottons, Jan. 7
 Cockings, cartridge cases, Nov. 29
 Coffey, heating liquids, Oct. 7
 Cogan, crushing machine, July 26
 Coleman, agriculture, July 19
 Coles, army defences, Sept. 29
 Collett, preparing ships, May 27
 Collier, chairs, Nov. 4
 Collier, drying wool, Jan. 7
 Collier, carriage wheels, May 27
 Collier, winding machine, April 1
 Collier, drying fibres, July 15
 Collins, printing surfaces, Nov. 4
 Collins, block printing, Mar. 22
 Collyer, crushing machine, Aug. 22
 Collyer, coating vessels, Jan. 23
 Colyer, cutting machine, May 27
 Combe, spinning, Dec. 13
 Combs, hackling flax, Oct. 27
 Conybeare, generating steam, Jan. 23
 Cookson, bricks and tiles, July 29
 Cooper, swords, Sept. 29
 Cooper, artificial light, Aug. 31
 Copeutt, gas, April 18
 Coppin, raising weights, Dec. 6
 Corbett, furnaces, Oct. 27
 Corfield, coupling chains, July 5
 Corlett, rails, Dec. 6
 Cottam, stable fittings, Nov. 29
 Cottam, doubling cottons, Jan. 7
 Covert, railway switch, Aug. 5
 Coulon, ornamenting skins, April 12
 Coulson, dressing machine, May 27
 Coupland, furnaces, Sept. 29
 Courage, metallic particles, Oct. 13
 Courage, furnaces, May 12
 Court, gas nibs, Sept. 8
 Courtauld, preparing crape, Mar. 11
 Cowan, soap, Dec. 9
 Cowban, spinning machine, Aug. 16
 Cowell, life preserver, April 8
 Cowen, dressing lace, April 8
 Cowgill, caps, Nov. 22
 M M 2

- Cowper, assorting fibres, May 6
 Cowper, india-rubber, April 12
 Cox, spurs, Dec. 20
 Cox, cutting rags, Dec. 13
 Craddock, harness, April 18
 Craft, pinafores, Oct. 7
 Craft, waterproofing, Mar. 18
 Cranston, grass-cutting machine, Aug. 19
 Cressey, cutting staves, Aug. 12
 Cressey, casks, May 10
 Cressey, casks, July 26
 Crichton, time-keepers, June 10
 Critchley, pistons, June 24
 Crofts, net fabrics, April 5
 Crooker, paddle wheels, Sept. 29
 Crosland, weaving fabrics, Aug. 16
 Crossdale, boots and shoes, June 10
 Crossley, treating yarns, April 18
 Crowther, preparing potash, July 26
 Crum, printing fabrics, July 22
 Cuit, railway breaks, May 21
 Cunliffe, woven fabrics, Aug. 19
 Cunningham, printing, Jan. 28
 Currie, spindles, Aug. 12
 Curtis, finishing cloths, Dec. 30
 Curtis, spinning mules, July 26
 Cutler, horse-shoes, Aug. 12
 Daft, telegraph conductors, Nov. 29
 Dale, motive power, Aug. 19
 Dales, manure, Nov. 25
 Dando, raising weights, June 17
 Dann, bonnet fronts, Dec. 6
 Darlington, furnaces, Oct. 27
 Daughish, acid gas, July 8
 Davey, valves, Jan. 28
 Davey, blasting powder, April 21.
 Davies, ventilating, Oct. 27
 Davies, raising vessels, Nov. 22
 Davies, wearing apparel, Nov. 29
 Davies, gas lamp, June 24
 Davies, piled fabrics, May 12
 Davies, stereotype plates, Jan. 28.
 Davies, gloves, April 12.
 Davies, billiard-tables, Feb. 25
 Davies, weaving velvets, April 18
 Davies, soap, Nov. 8
 Davies, bells and bolts, July 15
 Davis, engines, Jan. 5
 Davis, carriage wheels, Nov. 25
 Davis, music, Sept. 22
 Davis, sluice-valves, July 12
 Davison, locomotives, July 1
 Dawes, collecting manure, Aug. 22
 Dawes, hammers, Sept. 29
 Dawes, iron, Dec. 30
 Dawes, forge hammers, May 14
 Dawes, turf cutter, April 18
 Dawson, woollen cloths, May 10
 Deas, reaping machines, Dec. 17
 De Beauregard, steam, Aug. 31
 De Bergue, punching metal, Dec. 6
 De Bronac, chemicals, July 26
 De Forest, carriage springs, July 1
 Defries, pressure of gas, Nov. 4
 Defries, lamps, Sept. 15
 De la Rue, vegetable wax, Oct. 27
 Delpy, stay busks, Feb. 15
 De Massas, cleaning grain, Mar. 8
 Demoulin, distillation, Jan. 7
 Dendy, breakwaters, May 6
 Dennet, bayonets, Aug. 31
 De Pariente, gas burners, Mar. 18
 Dessales, sliding tubes, Dec. 20
 Desarmont, weaving looms, Aug. 19
 De Trets, splitting rock, Nov. 15
 Dewrance, pianofortes, Mar. 1
 Dick, yellow pigment, April 18
 Dick, keeping accounts, Dec. 23
 Dicks, boot screws, Oct. 13
 Dickson, railway chairs, May 6
 Diericks, coining, Dec. 17
 Diggle, weaving looms, April 12
 Diggle, weaving apparatus, May 27
 Dixon, rolling metals, Aug. 16
 Dixon, weaving fabrics, July 26
 Dixon, iron tubes, April 16
 Dobson, bird cages, April 29
 Dodge, india-rubber, Jan. 7
 Dodge, india-rubber, Aug. 12
 Dodge, colouring matter, Aug. 12
 Doig, gas lamps, Aug. 19
 Doley, metallic surfaces, Jan. 11
 Dorsett, distillation, July 22
 Doubavand, looms, Dec. 9
 Dougall, fire-arms, Aug. 31
 Doulton, earthenware jars, Dec. 6
 Drake, electricity, Oct. 27
 Draper, printing, July 1
 Draper, account books, Nov. 8
 Drayson, electric cables, Mar. 25
 Drouot, bakers' ovens, June 28
 Drummond, reaping machine, Mar. 11
 Dudgeon, gas regulator, June 7
 Dujardin, telegraphs, Aug. 2
 Duncan, steam, Sept. 15
 Duncan, electric signals, June 17
 Dunlop, cleaning apparatus, Aug. 31
 Dunn, covering floors, June 20
 Dunn, chemicals, April 12
 Dutton, mine accidents, Sept. 29
 Earl, harness, Dec. 6
 Earnshaw, night lights, Jan. 11
 Eason, tanning, April 18
 Easton, water courses, Jan. 18
 Eccles, pottery, July 15
 Eccles, plastic bricks, Sept. 29
 Eccles, power looms, June 7
 Eccles, bricks and tiles, June 7
 Edge, ammunition, June 14
 Edleston, preparing fabrics, June 24
 Edwards, stacking biscuit, Aug. 22
 Edwards, weaving looms, Oct. 13

- Edwards, blind furniture, Jan. 11
 Elder, paddle wheels, June 7
 Ellis, cleaning land, May 21
 Ellis, silk fabrics, Nov. 4
 Ellis, lace, Dec. 20
 Ellis, raising vessels, Aug. 5
 Ellisdon, reading chairs, Feb. 22
 Elwell, motive power, July 1
 Emerson, metallic substance, Oct. 27
 Emerson, treating ores, Aug. 12
 Emery, carriages, Oct. 7
 Ems, folding bedstead, Jan. 25
 Erwood, glass cloths, Sept. 8.
 Esson, gas meters, Feb. 25
 Evans, Hansom cabs, April 29
 Evans, steam boilers, May 12
 Evans, mine accidents, Nov. 15
 Evans, musical instruments, Feb. 15
 Evans, paper, Aug. 12
 Evans, steam, Sept. 22
 Evans, pumps, May 12
 Eveleigh, head coverings, July 29
 Evelyn, fire-arms, April 21
 Eveite, bedding, Dec. 9
 Faessler-Petzi, silk cleaning, Feb. 18
 Fairbairn, separating fibres, May 12
 Fairbairn, teeth of spur, Nov. 4
 Fairburn, carding wool, Sept. 29
 Fairgrieve, winding yarns, Aug. 16
 Fane, treating sewage, Jan. 7
 Fanshawe, liquids, Oct. 19
 Farmer, stair rods, Dec. 6
 Farrenc, gas lighting, Nov. 22
 Faure, madder, Dec. 20
 Fawcett, food for cattle, Aug. 5
 Fay, railway breaks, Aug. 12
 Featherstonhaugh, gauges, Jan. 28
 Felix, castors, May 6
 Fellows, vent peg, May 14
 Ferrabee, carding wool, June 2
 Ferrabee, steam engines, June 2
 Ferrabee, bats of fleece, Dec. 2
 Ferry, oil, Dec. 6
 Field, telegraphs, Jan. 11
 Fielden, building cops, Mar. 1
 Fielden, weaving looms, Aug. 12
 Fielding, building cops, Mar. 1
 Figgitt, syringes, Feb. 18
 Fincham, ovens and kilns, April 12
 Firmin, cleansing food, Mar. 18
 Firth, grinding saws, Sept. 22
 Fisher, furnaces, June 2
 Fisher, ordnance, Dec. 2
 Fleetwood, shaping metals, Dec. 9
 Fletcher, telegraph cables, May 14
 Fletcher, bolts and bars, May 27
 Fogg, pressure gauges, Jan. 28
 Forot, ornamenting fabrics, Feb. 4
 Forster, hammocks, July 8
 Foster, spinning wool, April 21
 Foster, spinning frames, July 5
 Fowke, umbrellas, April 8
 Fowke, fire-engines, Mar. 11
 Fowler, locomotives, Feb. 25
 Fowler, agriculture, July 19
 Fowler, motive power, May 3
 Fowler, steam power, Jan. 11
 Foxwell, sewing machines, Aug. 16
 Fraissinet, preparing iron, Aug. 2
 Francis, treatment of tea, Oct. 27
 Fraser, ploughs, April 29
 Frearson, dress fastenings, July 1
 Freer, planting seed, Oct. 13
 Friend, distance signal, June 10
 Frodsham, steam boilers, June 2
 Fry, grinding mills, Nov. 29
 Fryer, locomotives, May 6
 Fryer, tanning hides, Mar. 22
 Fuller, india-rubber, Dec. 17
 Fuller, steam engines, Mar. 18
 Furnival, kilns and ovens, June 17
 Fyfe, stop-cocks, Mar. 1
 Gadesden, solutions of sugar, Oct. 13
 Galliard, portable fountains, April 1
 Gallon, slotting machines, July 1
 Galloway, fuel, June 10
 Gammon, envelopes, Jan. 14
 Gardiner, railway axles, May 21
 Gardner, boots and shoes, Aug. 12
 Gardner, preparing flax, April 21
 Garforth, steam engines, June 28
 Garforth, pistons, Sept. 22
 Garnett, cleaning fibres, Aug. 19
 Garrett, goblets, Sept. 29
 Garrett, thrashing machine, June 2
 Garton, treating sugar, July 26
 Gasse, railway breaks, April 12
 Gathercole, envelopes, July 26
 Gatty, colours, Jan. 7
 Gatwood, railway springs, Aug. 19
 Gedge, steel, Nov. 4
 Gerhard, alumina, April 8
 Gibbons, fixing knobs, April 12
 Geyelin, gas burners, June 10
 Gibbs, manure, Nov. 22
 Gibson, steering apparatus, June 14
 Gidlow, engine breaks, Jan. 7
 Gilbee, fatty matters, June 17
 Gilbee, silk thread, Aug. 31
 Giles, locomotives, Jan. 11
 Gill, distillation, Aug. 12
 Gillard, heating apparatus, April 8
 Gillies, marking machine, June 14
 Gillett, grinding, Sept. 29
 Gillott, pen-holders, Sept. 29
 Gingell, metal bars, Sept. 15
 Gist, knitting machines, Feb. 11
 Glasgow, circular motion, Oct. 13
 Glass, telegraph cables, Nov. 25
 Glover, measuring angles, Jan. 25
 Godefroy, gutta percha, Jan. 25
 Goodfellow, steam engines, Mar. 22

- Gordon, cast iron, April 8
 Gorman, furnaces, May 21
 Gossage, iron, Nov. 25
 Gossage, caustic soda, Oct. 27
 Gossage, copper ores, Aug. 31
 Gossage, alkali waste, Aug. 16
 Gosteau, cooking apparatus, June 28
 Gourlay, moulds for casting, Nov. 8
 Graham, driving machine, July 22
 Grant, ships' cooking, Oct. 13
 Grant, baking ovens, Mar. 25
 Grant, colour printing, Mar. 22
 Graveley, purifying sea-water, Oct. 27
 Gray, separating wool, May 10
 Greaves, making roads, Jan. 18
 Green, hinges, Jan. 18
 Green, purifying sugar, Nov. 22
 Green, steam boilers, Nov. 4
 Green, rugs, Nov. 11
 Green, mowing machines, Nov. 15
 Gregg, currying leather, June 24
 Greenhalgh, treating yarn, Aug. 2
 Greenhalgh, steam boilers, Jan. 7
 Greenshields, purifying gas, Nov. 22
 Greenwood, gassing fabrics, June 28
 Greenwood, treating hemp, June 28
 Greenwood, heating apparatus, Jan. 28
 Gresham, preserving papers, Jan. 28
 Griffin, gas furnaces, Nov. 15
 Griffiths, lubricators, May 24
 Griffiths, baths, Mar. 25
 Grimes, lights, Dec. 20
 Grimes, beer engines, May 6
 Grimond, treating jute, April 21
 Grimond, hearthrugs, April 12
 Grimshaw, compressing, Nov. 29
 Grissell, moving weights, June 28
 Grist, cutting staves, July 12
 Grumel, dyeing fabrics, Sept. 29
 Gryll, electric cables, Mar. 18
 Guerinot, locomotives, June 20
 Guthrie, overshoes, May 30
 Guye, escapements, Feb. 8
 Gwyn, fire-arms, Dec. 20
 Hadfield, heating, Nov. 15
 Hadfield, casks, Nov. 22
 Hadfield, carboys and barrels, May 27
 Hadley, carriages, Mar. 15
 Hadlow, marking linen, July 15
 Hadwen, yarns, Sept. 15
 Hadwen, power looms, Aug. 2
 Haeck, taps and valves, Feb. 4
 Hagan, smokey chimneys, Dec. 20
 Haggett, metals, Sept. 15
 Haines, driving bands, Nov. 4
 Hale, rockets, May 6
 Hall, agriculture, Aug. 19
 Hall, applying power, Jan. 28
 Hall, electric cables, Feb. 8
 Hall, reaping machines, Dec. 13
 Hall, weaving looms, Jan. 11
 Hamilton, locks, April 5
 Hamilton, treating resin, July 15
 Hamilton, prime movers, Oct. 13
 Hammond, fire-arms, July 8
 Hanbury, metal tubes, Mar. 11
 Hancock, telegraph wires, May 14
 Hancock, tilling machine, April 8
 Hancock, electric wires, May 27
 Hancock, motive power, Sept. 20
 Hands, preparing skins, Mar. 11
 Harden, tubular boilers, Jan. 25
 Harden, furnaces, July 5
 Hardie, passage of fluids, Jan. 25
 Harfield, windlasses, Feb. 11
 Harfield, ships' capstans, Dec. 20
 Harfield, capstans, Dec. 20
 Harfield, shackling chains, Dec. 20
 Harker, iron ships, Aug. 31
 Harkes, ploughs, Mar. 1
 Harmer, dry gas-meters, Nov. 25
 Harman, steam boilers, Oct. 18
 Harper, bonnet feathers, Dec. 17
 Harrington, umbrellas, Oct. 7
 Harris, steam power, July 1
 Harrison, weaving looms, Sept. 29
 Hart, fire arms, Sept. 29
 Hart, chandeliers, Feb. 22
 Hart, killing flies, Sept. 15
 Hart, flow of fluids, Jan. 14
 Hartshorne, mills and shafts, July 15
 Hartley, steam, Oct. 13
 Harvey, screw presses, Jan. 25
 Haseltine, sewing machines, May 27
 Haseltine, metallic chains, June 10
 Hawkins, harness, Oct. 7
 Haworth, spinning machines, May 21
 Hawthorn, furnaces, May 12
 Hayward, dressing fabrics, May 14
 Hellard, reaping machines, Aug. 31
 Henderson, rudders, May 6
 Henderson, weaving looms, Aug. 16
 Henderson, ores, Sept. 29
 Henderson, weaving fabrics, Jan. 7
 Henley, alcohol, Dec. 9
 Henry, mariner's compass, Oct. 18
 Henry, steam expansion, Mar. 18
 Henry, weaving, May 21
 Henry, twisting fibres, May 21
 Henry, boots and shoes, May 27
 Henry, supplying air, Oct. 27
 Henry, charcoal, May 21
 Henry, locks, Oct. 27
 Henry, overshoes, Dec. 20
 Henson, waterproofing, Mar. 18
 Henson, waterproofing, May 14
 Henson, circular looms, Feb. 18
 Henson, treating starch, April 29
 Herapath, treatment of paper, Jan. 18
 Herbert, warp lace, July 8
 Herring, steam boilers, Aug. 5
 Herrmann, connecting pipes, Feb. 15

- Hess, ornamental surfaces, Mar. 11
 Hetherington, spinning, Sept. 29
 Heywood, weaving, Mar. 15
 Heywood, drying fabrics, April 1
 Heyworth, weaving looms, Feb. 25
 Hick, steam boilers, Mar. 18
 Higgin, treating madder, Oct. 19
 Higgins, doubling cotton, Jan. 21
 Higgins, reefing sails, Feb. 22
 Hill, ships' chains, Feb. 22
 Hill, shearing metals, Feb. 22
 Hill, joints, Jan. 7
 Hill, omnibuses, Mar. 22
 Hill, weaving fabrics, June 10
 Hilliard, knife sharpener, July 15
 Hinde, iron and steel, Mar. 15
 Hinde, coating metals, July 15
 Hine, joint for carpentry, Aug. 22
 Hine, winding silks, Jan. 28
 Hinks, knife cleaner, Jan. 25
 Hinks, taps and cocks, Mar. 4
 Hipp, telegraphs, Feb. 8
 Hirsch, screw propellers, Dec. 30
 Hirst, power looms, July 29
 Hobbs, projectiles, Mar. 1
 Hockin, dock gates, Mar. 4
 Hodgson, fuel, June 10
 Hoga, electric telegraphs, Feb. 25
 Holden, combing wool, July 5
 Hollingworth, paper, Sept. 29
 Holman, pianofortes, April 1
 Holmes, boot eyelet holes, Oct. 18
 Holmes, electric telegraphs, Oct. 27
 Holroyd, knife shearer, April 8
 Holroyd, woollen cloth, Aug. 81
 Holt, steam boilers, Sept. 8
 Holt, weaving looms, Feb. 11
 Holt, woven fabrics, July 12
 Honeyman, propellers, July 19
 Hood, cisterns, July 1
 Hooper, insulators, Oct. 7
 Hooper, india-rubber, Oct. 7
 Hope, engraving, Jan. 18
 Hope, calico printing roller, Mar. 15
 Hope, electric cables, April 1
 Hopkinson, steam boilers, May 12
 Horn, watch balance, Jan. 14
 Horner, hackling flax, Aug. 12
 Hornsby, ploughing, May 10
 Hornsby, ploughs, Aug. 31
 Horsemann, cables, June 10
 Hosking, furnaces, April 21
 Hosking, lamps, Aug. 5
 Howard, ploughs, June 20
 Howard, condensing steam, Dec. 20
 Howard, horse rake, Nov. 8
 Howden, cutting machine, May. 21
 Howden, motive power, Sept. 15
 Howe, boiling water, Mar. 15
 Howe, smiths' forges, Mar. 22
 Howell, applying heat, Dec. 6
 Howell, stop-cocks, July 15
 Hudson, weaving looms, Aug. 31
 Hughes, motive power, Nov. 4
 Hughes, night clock, Dec. 18
 Hughes, measuring, July 15
 Hughes, crimping, Jan. 5
 Hughes, biscuits, July 5
 Hughes, electric wires, July 8
 Hughes, fatty substances, Dec. 13
 Hughes, tin, Oct. 7
 Hughes, railways, April 21
 Hughes, artificial sandstone, Nov. 18
 Hughes, preserving food, Aug. 22
 Hughes, gas lighting, May 21
 Hume, warming, July 19
 Humphrys, steering apparatus, Oct. 13
 Humphrys, steam engines, May 6
 Humphrys, marine steam engines, Nov. 15
 Hunt, resin, Dec. 17
 Hunt, steam boilers, April 18
 Hunter, anchors, June 17
 Huntley, cooking apparatus, Aug. 2
 Hurn, fibrous materials, Jan. 25
 Hurry, motive power, Nov. 4
 Hurst, wrench, Aug. 31
 Hushett, cast steel, July 8
 Hussey, ships' blocks, April 29
 Hutchinson, india-rubber, April 8
 Hutchinson, damp, Sept. 15
 Hyde, carriage springs, Mar. 1
 Iliffe, buttons, Sept. 29
 Imray, printing, Jan. 25
 Ingram, railway signals, Mar. 29
 Ingram, railway breaks, Jan. 7
 Ireland, cupola furnaces, Jan. 28
 Ivory, rotary engines, Sept. 15
 Ivory, steam boilers, Sept. 15
 Jackson, steel bands, May 3
 Jackson, lubricators, Jan. 25
 Jackson, sizing yarn, April 12
 Jackson, fire bars, Nov. 8
 Jackson, pianofortes, July 26
 Jacoby, bobbin net, Mar. 25
 Jaloureaux, pipes, April 5
 James, railway chairs, Nov. 29
 James, motive power, Aug. 12
 Jeffery, photography, Nov. 4
 Jeffery, rotary motion, Dec. 17
 Jennings, parchment, June 17
 Jobson, fire-places, May 21
 Jobson, moulds, Feb. 11
 Jobson, crushing machines, Feb. 11
 Jobson, lubricators, Aug. 12
 Johnson, propellers, Aug. 2
 Johnson, boot trees, June 24
 Johnson, combing wool, Oct. 7
 Johnson, steam generators, Nov. 22
 Johnson, inkstands, Jan. 14
 Johnson, grinding, Sept. 29
 Johnson, fire-arms, June 24
 Johnson, postage-stamps, Oct. 7

- Johnson, cigarettes, July 1
 Johnson, lubricating, Oct. 27
 Johnson, waste steam, Nov. 25
 Johnson, moulding metals, Oct. 27
 Johnson, steam regulators, Feb. 8
 Johnson, sheet tin, Aug. 5
 Johnson, potassium, Sept. 29
 Johnson, locomotives, April 8
 Johnson, railway rails, June 14
 Johnson, ornamental surfaces, Oct. 19
 Johnson, india-rubber, July 8
 Johnson, boring apparatus, Mar. 4
 Johnson, casting steel, May 27
 Johnson, knitting frames, Dec. 13
 Johnson, boots and shoes, June 24
 Johnson, sounding apparatus, May 8
 Johnson, horse taming, July 26
 Johnson, steam engines, Dec. 23
 Johnson, lubricators, Aug. 12
 Johnson, axle boxes, Aug. 12
 Johnson, pianofortes, July 1
 Johnson, powdered substances, Nov. 22
 Johnson, generating steam, June 24
 Johnson, pressure gauges, May 21
 Johnson, shaping wood, June 28
 Johnson, bellows, Feb. 8
 Johnson, roads and paths, Feb. 25
 Johnson, treating ores, Nov. 4
 Johnson, electric cables, May 3
 Johnson, kneading dough, May 3
 Johnson, railway breaks, Jan. 11
 Johnston, waterclosets, Mar. 25
 Jones, drainage, Jan. 25
 Jones, sewing machines, April 8
 Jones, ventilating flues, Nov. 4
 Jones, measuring liquids, Jan. 14
 Jones, coke, May 3
 Jones, stereoscopes, Nov. 22
 Jones, joints, Feb. 25
 Jones, grinding mills, Nov. 22
 Jordan, navigation, May 21
 Joseph, coke ovens, Aug. 5
 Jossa, furnaces, June 10
 Joy, hydraulic engines, Sept. 8
 Joyce, wool combing, July 1
 Judkins, gas burners, May 10
 Jullion, gelatine, Aug. 31
 Jullion, paper, May 6
 Kay, colouring matter, June 28
 Kay, colouring matter, July 8
 Kay, bleaching fabrics, Dec. 20
 Kay, gas meters, Dec. 23
 Kay, spinning fibres, Nov. 25
 Kellermann, vegetable dye, Jan. 21
 Kellingley, lubricating, Nov. 4
 Kelly, gas-burners, Sept. 22
 Kempe, winding fabrics, Feb. 8
 Kennedy, drying grain, April 1
 Kenney, bridges, June 17
 Kent, churns, Feb. 18
 Kernot, paraffine, May 27
 Kerr, fire-arms, June 10
 Kerr, fire-arms, Feb. 25
 Kershaw, weaving, May 20
 Ketchum, roasting machine, April 21
 Kiallmark, cements, May 20
 Kingsford, peat for fuel, Dec. 23
 Kingston, railway trains, Oct. 27
 Kinsey, steam engines, April 21
 Kirrage, elastic substance, April 21
 Knight, aerating liquids, Feb. 25
 Knowelden, hydraulics, June 28
 Knowles, spinning cotton, Jan. 21
 Knowles, preparing cotton, Feb. 22
 Knowles, power looms, Nov. 22
 Koch, tread power, Dec. 23
 Kottula, cleansing, Dec. 13
 Kottula, soap, Jan. 25
 Kottula, manure, Jan. 7
 Kottula, lubricators, Mar. 8
 Lacy, spinning, Sept. 15
 Lacey, gas regulators, Oct. 27
 Laing, wet gas-meters, Oct. 27
 Lakin, spinning mules, Feb. 25
 Lamb, lifeboats, Mar. 4
 Lamb, heating water, June 7
 Lambert, horse-collars, Jan. 14
 Lambert, seed drills, Sept. 15
 Laming, purifying gas, Dec. 13
 Laming, purifying gas, May 27
 Lancaster, fire-arms, April 5
 Lançon, watches, Aug. 16
 Lander, ornamenting china, Mar. 25
 Landre, lighting, Nov. 11
 Lane, screws, July 8
 Langton, railway keys, Sept. 8
 Lardenois, pulp articles, Oct. 27
 Larochette, brewing, Sept. 15
 Lavater, floor coverings, Mar. 18
 Laubereau, air engines, July 22
 Lauth, rolling metals, July 5
 Lauth, rods and shafts, May 27
 Law, fastenings, July 26
 Lawrence, elastic gums, Nov. 22
 Lawson, fibrous substances, Oct. 27
 Lea, lubricators, May 21
 Leach, reeling thread, Aug. 16
 Leach, winding thread, July 29
 Leach, tin plates, Nov. 22
 Leadbetter, pumps, Nov. 4
 Leahy, carriages, Nov. 8
 Leake, furnaces, Aug. 31
 Leck, drying fabrics, Feb. 25
 Lee, steam engines, July 26
 Lee, ploughs, Aug. 12
 Lees, punching holes, June 10
 Lees, oil cans, April 18
 Leeson, ornamental fringes, Nov. 20
 Legg, cutting tobacco, May 30
 Lehr, umbrellas, Mar. 8
 Leigh, purifying gas, May 6
 Leigh, purifying gas, May 10

- Leigh, spinning flax, Feb. 4
 Leigh, paper making, Dec. 20
 Lejeune-Chaumont, fire-arms, Dec. 30
 Leonard, paraffine candles, May 6
 Leoni, magnesia, Sept. 15
 Le Prince, boots and shoes, July 19
 Leslie, gas, May 10
 Leveque, stopping horses, June 28
 Levy, hats and caps, Oct. 27
 Lewis, dress fastenings, April 29
 Lewis, ships' sails, May 12
 Lewthwaite, clocks, Oct. 19
 Libotte, steam break, Oct. 27
 Libotte, drawing coals, Sept. 15
 Lichtenstadt, textile fabrics, Aug. 22
 Light, electric cables, Feb. 11
 Lightfoot, colouring fabrics, Aug. 16
 Lightfoot, printing yarns, May 20
 Lightoller, spinning cottons, July 8
 Linde, soap, July 15
 Lindner, fire-arms, Feb. 25
 Lister, windlasses, Dec. 20
 Lister, dyeing wool, Feb. 11
 Livermore, shuttlecocks, May 12
 Loam, raising sewage, May 6
 Lodge, ships' batteries, Sept. 8
 Loos, gas regulators, May 24
 Lowe, carriage axle, June 2
 Luis, cooling apparatus, Aug. 31
 Luis, stamping press, April 5
 Luis, railway seats, Dec. 30
 Luis, axle-trees, Dec. 30
 Luis, candles, June 24
 Luis, gutta-percha goshes, Mar. 15
 Luis, fire-arms, Feb. 11
 Luis, siphon meter, Dec. 9
 Luis, raising water, Oct. 7
 Luis, starch and pulp, Mar. 18
 Luis, washing wool, Dec. 23
 Luis, boring machine, April 21
 Luis, horse machine, July 26
 Luis, axle-boxes, Jan. 28
 Luis, wheel tires, Dec. 30
 Luis, windmill, Dec. 13
 Luis, gas burners, Dec. 13
 Luis, joining cast-iron, April 5
 Luis, gas kilns, Mar. 1
 Luis, trusses, Jan. 28
 Luis, fastenings, May 6
 Luis, ladies' dress, May 6
 Lund, umbrellas, Aug. 16
 Lundy, fire-arms, Nov. 22
 Lyall, omnibuses, Oct. 27
 Maberly, ships of war, May 6
 Maberly, candlesticks, May 24
 Maberly, spring power, Aug. 2
 McConnell, steam boilers, Aug. 5
 M'Crummen, paper, Jan. 25
 MacDonald, punching, Dec. 13
 McDougall, coating metals, Oct. 13
 Macfarlane, emptying liquids, Nov. 29
 Macintosh, telegraphs, Nov. 29
 Macintosh, tents, June 2
 Macintosh, flexible tubes, Nov. 29
 Macintosh, conductors, Jan. 28
 McIntosh, driving belts, Dec. 17
 McKean, farina, Nov. 8
 M'Kenzie, gas burners, June 17
 Mackenzie, printing, Oct. 19
 MacKenzie, ventilating, July 2
 MacKirdy, waterclosets, Jan. 28
 MacKirdy, preparing sugar, Jan. 28
 MacLellan, permanent way, Nov. 15
 McKnight, boilers, June 24
 Macnab, telegraphing, Sept. 8
 McNaught, steam engines, June 28
 McNaught, steam engines, Aug. 19
 Macpherson, preparing horn, June 24
 M'Sweeny, steering, May 6
 Maggs, washing machines, Nov. 29
 Maggs, harrows, Nov. 4
 Main, carriage wheels, Sept. 29
 Maissiat, wheels, Feb. 4
 Malam, gas, April 1
 Mallett, axles, Dec. 13
 Mallett, clocks, Nov. 11
 Manceaux, fire-arms, July 12
 Manceaux, fire-arms, Feb. 8
 Manning, millstones, Mar. 25
 Mansell, travelling case, Oct. 13
 Marçais, batteries, June 14
 Marcus, reaping machines, Mar. 29
 Margesson, treating sugar, Feb. 25
 Marion, sensitive paper, June 17
 Marino, waterclosets, April 16
 Marland, power looms, Apr. 18
 Marland, self-acting hook, Jan. 7
 Marland, cop tubes, Oct. 7
 Marshall, filtering fluids, Oct. 19
 Marshall, steam engines, June 14
 Marshall, steam engines, Jan. 18
 Martin, weaving, Aug. 5
 Martin, bonnet fronts, Oct. 7
 Martin, iron, April 18
 Martin, separating starch, April 8
 Martin, fire bars, Nov. 25
 Mason, ornamenting lace, Aug. 12
 Mason, pen boxes, Nov. 8
 Massey, ships' logs, Feb. 4
 Maason, diving machine, Mar. 25
 Mather, shearing machine, Jan. 25
 Mather, steam taps, Jan. 25
 Mather, drying yarns, April 16
 Mathews, liquids, Sept. 29
 Matley, economizing fuel, Jan. 21
 Maudslay, vitreous vessels, Jan. 28
 Maw, feeders, Jan. 13
 Mawdsley, drying yarns, Mar. 11
 Mawdsley, sizing paper, Mar. 11
 May, heat indicator, June 7
 Maynard, fire-arms, Sept. 22
 Maynard, electric cables, April 18

- Mead, gas-meters, May 12
 Meidinger, electric batteries, May 20
 Meikle, asphalte, Dec. 20
 Mein, glass bottles, Aug. 5
 Mellor, spinning cotton, May 14
 Menelaus, straightening bars, April 1
 Mennons, hydraulic pumps, Nov. 25
 Mennons, driving bands, Feb. 8
 Mennons, registering, Mar. 29
 Mennons, electricity, April 1
 Mennons, metallic surfaces, Feb. 8
 Mennons, sand moulds, Aug. 12
 Mennons, brick kiln, Dec. 13
 Mennons, phosphates of lime, Oct. 7
 Mennons, steam generators, Mar. 18
 Mennons, piston packing, Nov. 22
 Mennons, railway breaks, April 21
 Mennons, pipes, Sept. 29
 Mennons, bolts and rivets, Dec. 6
 Mennons, iron and steel, Feb. 25
 Merrell, washing apparatus, Nov. 29
 Merry, cleansing drains, Jan. 18
 Messenger, garden engines, Feb. 8
 Meyers, parasols, May 24
 Michel-Denys, railway crossings, Aug. 12
 Mickelthwaite, coating bands, Nov. 29
 Middleship, propelling ships, Sept. 22
 Midworth, tailors' iron, Nov. 11
 Miguel, trusses, Nov. 18
 Miller, generating steam, Oct. 27
 Miller, ships, Sept. 15
 Miller, winding yarn, Jan. 28
 Mills, pianofortes, Aug. 12
 Mills, weaving looms, April 18
 Mills, keys and gibs, Dec. 6
 Mills, spinning machine, April 1
 Milnes, weaving fabrics, Jan. 14
 Mitchell, steam engines, May 30
 Mitchell, spinning wool, April 8
 Monier, gas burners, Feb. 4
 Monnier, railway breaks, May 12
 Moody, straw fabric, Nov. 22
 Moore, refrigerators, April 1
 Moore, types, Oct. 13
 Montgomery, steam vessels, May 12
 Morewood, coating metals, Sept. 29
 Morgan, propelling vessels, June 24
 Morgan, candles, Oct. 13
 Morgan, iron, April 1
 Morris, cylinders, April 29
 Morrison, sewing machines, Mar. 8
 Morse, printing press, June 17
 Morton, figured fabrics, Nov. 4
 Morton, sextants, Sept. 29
 Morton, fences, Aug. 19
 Morville, window sashes, Dec. 23
 Moseley, carding, Sept. 29
 Moseley, india-rubber, June 24
 Moss, cutting, Sept. 22
 Moss, printing bank notes, Mar. 11
 Moss, printing ink, April 21
 Mossman, embossing presses, Aug. 31
 Mott, india-rubber, Jan. 23
 Moule, evaporation, Aug. 12
 Moxon, raising weights, Aug. 22
 Muir, weaving looms, Jan. 7
 Muire, moulding, Aug. 12
 Munn, reaping machines, Dec. 23
 Munn, horseshoes, Mar. 15
 Munro, chain harrows, Nov. 8
 Munro, metallic articles, April 1
 Musgrave, enclosures, Jan. 25
 Mushet, cast steel, June 14
 Mushet, metallic alloys, Dec. 13
 Mushet, cast steel, Aug. 2
 Mushet, shot, Dec. 13
 Mushet, metallic alloy, Aug. 9
 Mushet, metallic alloy, Sept. 15
 Mushet, metallic alloy, June 17
 Mushet, cast steel, June 17
 Mushet, cast steel, July 5
 Mushet, puddling iron, Oct. 27
 Mushet, metallic alloy, Dec. 13
 Mushet, cast steel, Oct. 27
 Mushet, cast steel, Sept. 15
 Mushet, cast steel, June 23
 Mushet, iron, Oct. 27
 Mushet, cast steel, Feb. 18
 Mushet, cast steel, Aug. 9
 Mushet, cast steel, Sept. 15
 Mushet, iron, Nov. 15
 Nalder, dressing grain, Aug. 31
 Napier, figures on glass, Oct. 19
 Napier, printing presses, April 18
 Nash, blocks, Dec. 20
 Nasmyth, motive power, Nov. 15
 Nation, lime, Dec. 2
 Naylor, indicators, Sept. 22
 Naylor, carpet looms, April 1
 Neal, gas, Sept. 22
 Needham, water gauges, July 29
 Neilson, steam hammers, Dec. 9
 Nelson, raising weights, May 21
 Nevill, steel, Oct. 27
 Newbery, coverings, Jan. 5
 Newbon, lifting machine, Jan. 25
 Newbon, raising weights, June 24
 Newcomb, motive power, Aug. 19
 Newington, agriculture, May 20
 Newington, distributing seeds, Sept. 22
 Newman, chains, July 19
 Newman, artificial teeth, Nov. 18
 Newman, window blinds, April 1
 Newton, marine engines, Aug. 31
 Newton, cricket bats, Aug. 31
 Newton, cylinders, Sept. 8
 Newton, stereoscopes, Sept. 8
 Newton, ammunition, April 29
 Newton, candles, Mar. 11
 Newton, barometers, July 15
 Newton, blowing machine, June 23
 Newton, condensing vapour, Dec. 30

- Newton, motive engines, Nov. 29
 Newton, sweeping carpets, Feb. 25
 Newton, steam boilers, Dec. 23
 Newton, steam engines, May 12
 Newton, steam engines, June 24
 Newton, gas-meters, Aug. 12
 Newton, washing machine, Aug. 16
 Newton, decoctions, April 16
 Newton, steam boilers, June 28
 Newton, propellers, May 12
 Newton, steam gauge, Sept. 29
 Newton, sorting machine, Jan. 25
 Newton, fish hooks, Sept. 29
 Newton, fire-arms, Oct. 27
 Newton, steam engines, Sept. 29
 Newton, alumina, Sept. 29
 Newton, rivets, Sept. 29
 Newton, seamless bags, Sept. 29
 Newton, drying paper, Nov. 8
 Newton, tailors' shears, Nov. 15
 Newton, lamps, Sept. 15
 Newton, hat bodies, Nov. 8
 Newton, horseshoes, Jan. 11
 Newton, bleaching, July 22
 Newton, cutting corks, Oct. 27
 Newton, measuring, June 2
 Newton, moulding clay, April 12
 Newton, steam engines, April 29
 Newton, billiard tables, Aug. 5
 Newton, separating metals, Oct. 7
 Newton, mowing machines, July 12
 Newton, reaping machines, April 8
 Newton, rolling iron, July 22
 Newton, alumina, Feb. 11
 Newton, sweeping floors, Jan. 28
 Newton, fire-arms, April 8
 Newton, life preserver, June 17
 Newton, printing calicoes, Dec. 30
 Newton, fire-arms, July 5
 Newton, revolvers, Dec. 30
 Newton, flexible pipes, Nov. 22
 Newton, minerals, May 27
 Newton, sewing machines, June 14
 Newton, gas burners, Jan. 28
 Newton, railway carriages, April 8
 Newton, electric machines, Sept. 15
 Newton, twisting machine, June 2
 Newton, fastenings, April 8
 Newton, steam boilers, Nov. 15
 Newton, moving metals, Oct. 7
 Newton, pyrogenous oils, Oct. 27
 Newton, cabins, Mar. 18
 Newton, lace, Feb. 4
 Newton, specific gravities, Dec. 6
 Newton, propellers, Jan. 28
 Newton, sewing machines, Sept. 15
 Newton, water wheels, Feb. 8
 Newton, hat bodies, Nov. 11
 Newton, nitric acid, Oct. 7
 Newton, reaping machines, May 10
 Newton, local attraction, Jan. 14
 Newton, pumps, April 1
 Newton, telegraphs, Jan. 28
 Newton, baking ovens, Aug. 19
 Newton, lifeboats, Aug. 16
 Newton, motive power, April 16
 Newton, polishing tools, Aug. 22
 Newton, railway axles, Jan. 28
 Newton, melting substances, Jan. 28
 Newton, bolts and rivets, May 10
 Newton, brushes, July 19
 Newton, telegraphing, July 1
 Newton, cleaning rice, Aug. 12
 Newton, condensers, May 21
 Newton, furnaces, Aug. 19
 Newton, cutting files, May 12
 Nibbs, ventilation, May 12
 Nicholls, fastenings, April 8
 Nicholson, crushing mills, Jan. 18
 Nicholson, needles, Aug. 31
 Nickels, telegraphs, Jan. 28
 Nicoll, cloaks, April 5
 Nicoll, trousers, Sept. 29
 Nissen, book indexes, Nov. 25
 Noone, generating gas, May 14
 Norman, furnaces, Nov. 4
 Normand, ships and vessels, March 22
 Normandy, fresh water, April 16
 Normandy, shaft tugs, June 28
 Normandy, sulphate of copper, Mar. 29
 Northcliffe, dyeing fabrics, Feb. 11
 Norton, drying wool, Jan. 28
 Norton, projectiles, Feb. 15
 Norton, drying fabrics, Nov. 15
 Nouveau, stopping bottles, April 5
 Nuthall, projectiles, July 15
 Oakes, spurs, Jan. 11
 Oates, scissors, May 27
 O'Hara, propellers, July 5
 Oliver, medicines, Dec. 20
 Oliver, lubricators, June 24
 Oliver, propellers, July 8
 Ollerenshaw, cotton gins, April 12
 Oram, steam, Sept. 22
 Ordish, roads and ways, May 6
 Orioli, bleaching, Dec. 30
 Orrell, spinning mules, Nov. 29
 Oswald, building ships, Oct. 27
 Ouwelant, fireplaces, Aug. 12
 Owen, railway wheels, Sept. 29
 Owen, bolts and nails, Nov. 25
 Owen, looms, April 16
 Owen, stockings, May 27
 Owen, distillation, Jan. 11
 Owen, trusses, Oct. 18
 Oxley, baths, Feb. 25
 Oxley, carriages, April 18
 Padwick, agriculture, Feb. 18
 Page, crown glass, Mar. 11
 Paget, looped fabrics, Aug. 31
 Palmer, railway break, Aug. 31
 Palmer, cutting machine, April 18

- Palmer, fire-arms, April 1
 Parent, looms, Dec. 30
 Parent, buttons, May 12
 Parfitt, gas burners, Nov. 15
 Parker, sewing machines, Aug. 31
 Parker, weaving looms, April 29
 Parker, agriculture, Mar. 22
 Parkes, hat ventilators, Nov. 4
 Parkes, copper tubes, Sept. 15
 Parkhurst, cotton gins, April 1
 Parkinson, railway signals, Jan. 25
 Parkinson, coffins, Aug. 12
 Parsons, safety valves, Feb. 25
 Parsons, steam boilers, Jan. 7
 Parsons, fatty matters, May 27
 Parsons, steam boilers, Feb. 25
 Parsons, metal sheets, Sept. 29
 Partridge, wagon axles, July 12
 Pascal, hot-air engines, Nov. 15
 Pascoe, feeding boilers, Jan. 25
 Pasquier, drying wool, Nov. 4
 Paterson, buckles, Aug. 12
 Paterson, propellers, Feb. 8
 Patrick, ivory substance, Nov. 22
 Patstone, glass shades, June 7
 Pattinson, heating iron, May 10
 Pattison, dyeing fabrics, Oct. 13
 Paul, spindles, Aug. 5
 Paulsen, cordials, July 22
 Pearce, weighing machines, Aug. 5
 Pearce, air-tight bottles, Feb. 13
 Pearsall, glass shades, July 8
 Pearson, trenails, Oct. 27
 Pellissier, railway breaks, Feb. 22
 Pendlebury, bleaching, June 10
 Penrice, propelling vessels, Nov. 25
 Penrice, tunnelling, April 13
 Pensuete, driving piles, June 7
 Perkes, cocoa-nut oil, April 12
 Perkin, dyeing fabrics, Oct. 27
 Perkins, condensers, Mar. 18
 Perley, launching boats, April 16
 Perry, distance signal, May 12
 Peters, passage of fluids, Jan. 28
 Peterson, cartridges, May 24
 Petre, ornamenting glass, May 12
 Petrie, washing rags, Aug. 2
 Petrie, drying fabrics, Feb. 11
 Phillips, sliding saashes, July 15
 Piatti, propellers, Jan. 18
 Picciotto, motive power, Dec. 6
 Pickering, signals, Jan. 28
 Pickford, manure, May 21
 Picksley, mowing machines, July 12
 Pickstone, sizing fabrics, Aug. 12
 Pilbeam, brad-awl screw, Feb. 11
 Pile, floating docks, May 30
 Pinhey, ships' compasses, Mar. 15
 Pinta, blank cheques, Feb. 18
 Pitman, condensers, Feb. 22
 Pitman, signals, Sept. 29
 Pitman, springs, Sept. 22
 Pitman, lifting apparatus, Feb. 11
 Pitman, bungs, June 24
 Platt, bricks and tiles, May 10
 Platt, spinning cottons, May 6
 Pooley, carding engine, April 8
 Pooley, spinning, Nov. 15
 Pontifex, condensers, May 14
 Porter, knitting machine, June 14
 Porteus, printing presses, Oct. 13
 Postlethwaite, harness pads, Aug. 12
 Possoz, alkalies, May 27
 Pottinger, dredging, Dec. 20
 Pougault, condensers, Jan. 21
 Poupard, wheel-skid, July 15
 Powell, stopping bottles, June 7
 Preston, looped fabrics, Jan. 14
 Preston, cutting files, Jan. 28
 Price, colours for dyeing, Nov. 4
 Price, railway joints, Aug. 12
 Price, smelting ore, Jan. 7
 Price, steam engines, Feb. 15
 Priedeaux, ships, Dec. 13
 Prince, fire-arms, July 26
 Prince, ships, Nov. 25
 Prince, ornamenting glass, June 20
 Prince, screw propellers, Nov. 22
 Prisle, advertising columns, Feb. 25
 Proal, photography, Dec. 20
 Proger, signal lanterns, Aug. 5
 Pullan, drying yarn, May 12
 Puls, hydrocarbons, Aug. 31
 Puls, distillating, Feb. 22
 Pursglove, pressure gauge, May 30
 Quail, saddle trees, Sept. 8
 Raberry, spinning cotton, Mar. 11
 Radley, cooking apparatus, June 20
 Rae, cisterns, May 6
 Railton, looms, June 10
 Railton, bonnet fronts, April 16
 Ralston, woven fabrics, May 16
 Rammell, propulsion, July 19
 Ramsbottom, printing fabrics, Oct. 27
 Ramsbottom, water meters, May 27
 Ramscar, fire-arms, May 14
 Randolph, steam engines, Oct. 13
 Ransome, grinding surfaces, June 10
 Rawson, combing wool, June 28
 Rawson, preparing wool, April 1
 Raymond, life raft, Aug. 12
 Raywood, sewing machines, July 26
 Redgrave, travelling cap, Sept. 22
 Redman, carriage ways, Aug. 5
 Redrup, cutting corks, Dec. 23
 Reid, ships and vessels, Mar. 18
 Reid, weaving, June 28
 Renton, finishing fabrics, July 1
 Renton, textile fabrics, July 1
 Rettig, anchors, Nov. 22
 Reynolds, wrought nails, Dec. 2
 Reynolds, refining sugar, Nov. 4

- Reynolds, hackling flax, Oct. 13
 Reynolds, propelling vessels, Aug. 12
 Rhodes, fire-proof safes, Sept. 15
 Richards, gas-meters, May 10
 Richardson, manure, June 28
 Richardson, breakwaters, July 22
 Richardson, copper ores, Oct. 27
 Richardson, chimneys, Sept. 8
 Richmond, measuring, April 29
 Rickett, locomotives, Jan. 25
 Riddel, horses' stalls, Dec. 30
 Riddell, sash lines, April 8
 Riddle, packing goods, April 18
 Rider, hats and caps, June 2
 Rider, ventilating hats, Jan. 25
 Ridge, coupling joints, Aug. 12
 Ridley, mine shafts, Mar. 25
 Ridsdale, fountain pen, Feb. 22
 Riepe, casting steel, Mar. 15
 Rigby, motive power, Aug. 31
 Rigolier, railway breaks, July 19
 Riley, head-dress, May 14
 Riley, looms, Jan. 7
 Ripley, scraping leather, Sept. 29
 Rippingille, fire-arms, April 8
 Robb, propellers, April 12
 Robbin, pumps, June 17
 Roberts, pistons, Sept. 15
 Roberts, candles, July 15
 Roberts, cigars, Sept. 22
 Roberts, filters, Dec. 20
 Roberts, cultivating land, Nov. 29
 Robertson, music, May 12
 Roberts, salts of alkalies, Mar. 25
 Robertson, winding yarns, Feb. 8
 Robertson, propeller, July 15
 Robertson, driving belts, Feb. 25
 Robertson, motive force, July 19
 Robertson, beer and spirits, Nov. 22
 Robertson, weaving, Aug. 31
 Robin, reaping machines, June 24
 Robinson, cask washing, Dec. 20
 Robinson, shirts, Feb. 22
 Robinson, spinning machines, July 12
 Roche, paper cigarettes, Aug. 31
 Rochette, soft soap, Nov. 8
 Rodier, regulating gas, Feb. 22
 Rogelet, potash, Dec. 13
 Rogers, coating wires, Oct. 1
 Rogers, electric cables, Mar. 29
 Rollason, waterproofing, June 10
 Rowan, steam engines, Feb. 22
 Rowan, steam, Dec. 20
 Rowan, wheels and bosses, Jan. 7
 Rowan, spinning, Oct. 7
 Rowley, leather cloth, Mar. 4
 Romaine, steam power, Nov. 4
 Romaine, portable railway, Mar. 22
 Ronald, spinning machine, June 17
 Ronald, rope and twine, June 17
 Royds, protecting iron, Dec. 30
 Rumney, dyeing fabrics, June 17
 Russell, heating iron, May 12
 Russell, marine engines, Sept. 29
 Russell, ships and vessels, May 12
 Russell, tea and coffee pots, July 15
 Russell, wheels, Dec. 6
 Sagar, colouring fabrics, June 28
 Salter, sorting letters, July 15
 Saltonstall, dredging, Nov. 29
 Sampson, propellers, Aug. 12
 Sampson, feeding boilers, June 16
 Samuel, railway sleepers, May 12
 Samuel, steam engines, May 30
 Samuels, lace machine, Aug. 16
 Samuelson, cutting roots, July 29
 Sander, jugs, May 12
 Sanders, ornamenting pictures, Aug. 12
 Sanderson, coating steel, Sept. 22
 Sang, conveying parcels, Jan. 7
 Sautter, air engines, Mar. 18
 Savage, excavating soil, Aug. 12
 Savory, medicine bottles, July 22
 Sax, musical instruments, Jan. 25
 Sax, wind music, Nov. 22
 Saxby, railway signals, May 10
 Saxby, securing rails, Nov. 4
 Scale, railway signals, Oct. 27
 Scarborough, boots and shoes, Mar. 4
 Scartliff, lubricating cans, Nov. 18
 Scattergood, looped fabrics, Mar. 25
 Schaffner, smelting ores, June 2
 Scheidel, fastenings, May 14
 Schiele, lubricators, Jan. 28
 Schiller, cables, Jan. 7
 Schlesinger, roasting machine, Jan. 28
 Schloss, locks and clasps, Aug. 16
 Scholfield, spinning cottons, Aug. 12
 Schwartzkopf, hammers, Dec. 13
 Schwartzkopf, boring apparatus, May 3
 Score, soap, May 12
 Scott, carriages, Aug. 16
 Scott, pumps, Jan. 7
 Scott, breakwaters, May 10
 Scott, refrigerator, Nov. 8
 Scott, cement, Aug. 2
 Scoffern, lubricating, Sept. 29
 Seaman, agricultural machines, Oct. 13
 Searle, electric signals, Sept. 22
 Seed, soapuds, Dec. 30
 Seguin, raising weights, May 12
 Sellers, screw bolts, Sept. 29
 Sellers, baking ovens, Oct. 7
 Selwyn, telegraph cables, June 14
 Servier, level indicators, Feb. 11
 Seton, carriage wheels, Dec. 20
 Shanks, manure, Feb. 25
 Shanks, stamping metals, Sept. 29
 Sharp, corking bottles, Sept. 22
 Sharps, fire-arms, Mar. 15
 Shaw, feed movement, Feb. 8
 Shaw, spindles, Feb. 15

- Shaw, sheepskins, April 18
 Shaw, propellers, Mar. 29
 Sheard, fire bars, Nov. 8
 Shipman, stamping, Sept. 15
 Sibley, weaving looms, May 30
 Sicard, cast steel, June 24
 Sidebottom, tubes, June 14
 Sidebottom, animal fibre, Nov. 4
 Sieber, power looms, Oct. 27
 Siemens, electric wires, July 8
 Siemens, refrigerators, Mar. 11
 Siemens, telegraphs, Aug. 5
 Silver, insulating wire, June 28
 Simon, Zeiodelite, Dec. 30
 Sinclair, platons, June 20
 Sinnock, telegraph cables, Sept. 15
 Skinner, ornamenting tiles, July 1
 Slate, blast furnaces, Jan. 28
 Sleigh, breakwaters, Jan. 21
 Smethurst, metallic pistons, June 10
 Smethurst, driving looms, July 29
 Smith, weaving looms, Aug. 31
 Smith, combing wool, Aug. 5
 Smith, locomotives, Jan. 25
 Smith, batbands, Nov. 25
 Smith, weaving looms, July 1
 Smith, steam engines, Feb. 18
 Smith, drawing machine, July 26
 Smith, motive power, Feb. 11
 Smith, paper, July 22
 Smith, raising ships, Nov. 29
 Smith, haymaking machines, Jan. 25
 Smith, artificial hair, May 3
 Smith, telegraphic cables, Nov. 29
 Smith, driving straps, Nov. 29
 Smith, arrows, Jan. 7
 Smith, hauling ropes, Jan. 28
 Smith, flow of fluids, Sept. 29
 Smith, colouring matter, Aug. 16
 Smith, pipe tongs, Jan. 7
 Smith, bees' wax, Nov. 25
 Smith, fare boxes, Sept. 15
 Smith, sewing machines, Nov. 22
 Smith, coating wire, Mar. 8
 Smith, shoeing beasts, April 16
 Smith, bricks and tiles, Jan. 7
 Smith, head coverings, April 21
 Smith, buoys, April 18
 Smith, agriculture, Oct. 27
 Smyth, life preservers, Mar. 15
 Snell, cutting machine, Mar. 15
 Sonneborn, cement, Dec. 20
 Souquiere, distilling coal, Oct. 27
 Soutter, drying linen, Feb. 8
 Sparre, paper, July 15
 Spary, fumigators, Feb. 25
 Speight, head-dresses, April 21
 Spence, preserving grain, May 27
 Spence, alum, Feb. 18
 Spence, condensing gas, Aug. 16
 Spence, tin plates, Jan. 14
 Spence, knapsacks, Oct. 27
 Spence, photography, July 1
 Spencer, springs, Feb. 8
 Spencer, waste matter, Sept. 29
 Spight, horse-hoes, Sept. 22
 Spiller, knapsacks, May 30
 Standen, artificial manure, Dec. 23
 Steane, candles, Sept. 22
 Stark, artificial manure, Oct. 13
 Steel, brewing and distilling, Jan. 18
 Stephens, railway signals, July 12
 Steven, heating apparatus, June 24
 Stevens, cooking utensil, July 15
 Stevens, fire grates, Oct. 7
 Stevenson, spinning, Sept. 15
 Stewart, pianofortes, June 7
 Stewart, pressing, Nov. 25
 Stoker, funeral carriage, July 26
 Stokes, screws, June 10
 Stott, warping mills, May 14
 Stuart, fishing nets, Oct. 7
 Stuart, fishing nets, July 1
 Suter, furniture castor, Sept. 8
 Sutton, photographic lens, Nov. 15
 Swinburn, fire-arms, Mar. 29
 Sykes, fatty matters, Aug. 2
 Szerelmey, rust in metals, Nov. 29
 Talbot, lighter, Oct. 27
 Tallent, leather, Dec. 18
 Tangye, hydraulic presses, April 16
 Tasker, threshing machines, Jan. 14
 Tasker, ploughs, Mar. 29
 Tatlow, railway breaks, Mar. 8
 Tatton, silk, Oct. 7
 Taylor, weaving looms, Sept. 15
 Taylor, paper, Sept. 22
 Taylor, steam engines, May 12
 Taylor, preparing skins, May 10
 Taylor, pneumatics, Jan. 28
 Taylor, raising weights, June 17
 Taylor, stoves, Dec. 30
 Taylor, gloves, Mar. 15
 Taylor, rarefying air, June 14
 Taylor, healds, Jan. 18
 Taylor, pianofortes, Jan. 25
 Taylor, sewers and drains, Jan. 25
 Taylor, damp, Dec. 20
 Tearne, ornamenting surfaces, July 15
 Tempest, cotton machine, Mar. 8
 Templar, umbrellas, July 22
 Templeman, artificial fuel, Aug. 22
 Tertian-Moret, disinfectors, Jan. 28
 Theroulde, chemicals, May 12
 Thierry furnaces, Jan. 14
 Thirion, mills, Sept. 15
 Thomas, firearms, Jan. 11
 Thomas, ship's propeller, Sept. 29
 Thomas, caustic alkaline lees, Jan. 18
 Thompson, salt, Dec. 13
 Thompson, clod-crushers, Mar. 18
 Thomson, hooped skirts, Oct. 7

- Thomson, bleaching yarn, Mar. 8
 Thomson, rugs, Mar. 15
 Thomson, shuttles, Nov. 4
 Thorman, chain cables, May 14
 Thornton, bricks, Sept. 8
 Thow, furnaces, May 27
 Till, nails, May 3
 Tillett, matches, Sept. 22
 Tillie, shirt fronts, July 8
 Timms, bits, Feb. 25
 Tindall, crushing, Dec. 6
 Tinkler, churns, April 5
 Tirebuck, printing, Dec. 13
 Todd, fibrous materials, Oct. 27
 Todd, steam engines, May 27
 Tomlinson, stops and taps, May 21
 Tompson, medicine, June 23
 Toms, ornamenting fabrics, July 5
 Toshach, driving machines, Mar. 4
 Toussaint, plastic moulds, July 8
 Tower, damping paper, Aug. 31
 Treeby, fire-arms, Jan. 28
 Trevithick, sails and keels, Mar. 22
 Tripler, asphaltum, Jan. 18
 Trotman, hair pins, Feb. 22
 Trotter, reaping machines, July 15
 Truss, pipes, Oct. 19
 Tuck, break waters, Nov. 15
 Tuck, telegraphs, May 14
 Tucker, auger handles, May 10
 Turnbull, roads and ways, July 8
 Turner, steam engines, June 24
 Turner, waterproof paper, Dec. 20
 Turner, coverings, Mar. 4
 Turner, weaving looms, Feb. 18
 Turner, steam engines, Nov. 4
 Turney, packing pins, Mar. 15
 Twells, loop fabrics, April 18
 Twigg, fusée-ignitor, Aug. 31
 Tyler, waterclosets, May 12
 Tyssen, indicators, Sept. 22
 Valda, stud fastenings, Nov. 15
 Varley, electric signals, Dec. 13
 Vasserot, wire rope, Aug. 12
 Vasserot, dressing fabrics, Mar. 15
 Vasserot, stereoscopes, Dec. 13
 Vasserot, diving apparatus, Sept. 22
 Vasserot, projectiles, Feb. 11
 Vasserot, smoothing irons, May 14
 Vasserot, reflectors, April 8
 Vasserot, pendulums, June 14
 Vasserot, glass roofs, Jan. 21
 Verdeil, treating madder, Aug. 12
 Verel, manure, Nov. 8
 Vero, coverings, Jan. 7
 Versman, treating fabrics, July 8
 Vicars, bread, Aug. 19
 Vicars, furnaces, Feb. 11
 Vidie, measuring apparatus, Mar. 11
 Viellard-Migeon, rivets, June 2
 Viette, printing ink, July 1
 Viney, portmanteaus, May 30
 Vion, electricity, Mar. 4
 Vivian, smelting copper, July 1
 Wade, weaving machine, Mar. 11
 Wadsworth, gas burners, May 21
 Wadsworth, boots and shoes, May 6
 Wagner, cleansing water, Aug. 5
 Wain, reefing sails, Jan. 7
 Wainwright, ventilating, April 18
 Walker, filterers, April 16
 Walker, electric cables, Feb. 4
 Walker, printing blankets, Feb. 23
 Walker, shaping metals, Feb. 4
 Walker, looking-glasses, Nov. 15
 Waller, motive power, April 18
 Waller, preparing liquids, July 29
 Waller, joining leather, Sept. 8
 Wansbrough, stereoscopes, Nov. 29
 Wappenstein, cop tubes, July 12
 Ward, making halds, Oct. 18
 Warder, beams and girders, Jan. 21
 Wardill, raising weights, May 8
 Wardill, windlass, June 10
 Waring, safety lamps, Dec. 6
 Warne, floor coverings, Jan. 25
 Warne, covering wire, May 21
 Warne, covering wire, Aug. 12
 Warne, packing machinery, July 5
 Warner, iron, Sept. 15
 Warner, cocks and taps, May 30
 Warner, treating iron, July 22
 Washburn, wheels, May 6
 Watkins, lubricating wheels, Nov. 29
 Watkins, brushes, Sept. 22
 Watkins, candles, Jan. 28
 Watson, paper, June 28
 Webb, spinning yarns, Jan. 28
 Weber, dyeing fabrics, June 2
 Webster, separating liquids, April 21
 Webster, steel wire, Jan. 14
 Weedon, knife cleaner, Feb. 25
 Weeks, chemicals, June 24
 Weild, pile fabrics, Nov. 25
 Weild, coating metal, Sept. 8
 Welch, tobacco, May 14
 Welch, picture frames, Dec. 20
 Welch, dressing yarns, Oct. 27
 Welsford, tanning, Nov. 15
 Welsh, scarfs, April 1
 West, covering wire, Feb. 11
 Westerby, lubricating, April 18
 Weston, washing machines, Jan. 28
 Weston, pulleys, Aug. 12
 Wheat, drilling machines, Oct. 27
 Wheatcroft, lace and blonde, June 2
 Wheatcroft, goffering, Sept. 8
 Wheeldon, mirrors, Oct. 7
 Wheeler, mangling machines, Jan. 7
 Whitaker, mowing machines, Oct. 13
 White, gauges, June 2
 White, respiration, July 22

- White, purifying air, June 24
 White, ships' pumps, June 28
 Whitehead, purled wire, July 19
 Whitelaw, drains, Feb. 25
 Whittam, metallic surfaces, June 10
 Whitworth, ammunition, April 16
 Wiert, generating steam, Jan. 25
 Wight, cast-metal pipes, Dec. 20
 Wiggzell, nails, June 28
 Wildes, vegetable pulp, Jan. 14
 Wiley, needle boxes, Sept. 22
 Wiley, ever-pointed pencils, Feb. 25
 Wilkins, valves, Sept. 22
 Wilkins, drain pipes, July 26
 Wilkins, flower vases, Aug. 5
 Wilkinson, printing presses, Dec. 20
 Wilkinson, buttons, Nov. 4
 Wilkinson, twisting silk, Aug. 12
 Willans, bog for metals, Oct. 7
 Williams, screw stocks, Sept. 29
 Williams, dyeing fabrics, Dec. 6
 Williams, colouring, Sept. 29
 Williams, steam boilers, Dec. 23
 Williams, locomotives, Jan. 7
 Williams, steam power, Aug. 31
 Williamson, gas burners, Dec. 23
 Williamson, liquorice root, Oct. 13
 Williamson, chemicals, June 17
 Willis, spinning machine, July 22
 Wilson, carbonate of soda, Nov. 4
 Wilson, band saws, Feb. 22
 Wilson, lubricating oils, Feb. 11
 Wilson, turning wood, Jan. 18
 Wilson, ordnance, Aug. 12
 Wilson, hydraulics, Oct. 27
 Wilson, hose and pipes, June 10
 Wilson, tilling land, May 30
 Wilson, fire-arms, Oct. 7
 Wilson, ventilating, Aug. 2
 Wilson, pumps, June 7
 Wilson, felt hats, Mar. 18
 Wilson, floating docks, Jan. 11
 Wilson, agriculture, April 1
 Winstanley, pumps, Oct. 27
 Wood, raising boats, Oct. 7
 Wood, embroidering, Nov. 15
 Wood, dyeing fabrics, Dec. 2
 Wood, trusses, Oct. 13
 Wood, cork cutting, May 12
 Woodcock, warming air, Jan. 14
 Woodcock, paper marks, April 16
 Woodcock, shafts and tubes, May 6
 Woolner, feeders, Jan. 5
 Worrall, locomotives, Jan. 11
 Worth, spinning cotton, Feb. 11
 Wotton, metals, Aug. 31
 Wray, electric wires, April 8
 Wray, reaping machines, Dec. 23
 Wright, fire-bars, Mar. 29
 Wright, nursing machine, Aug. 12
 Wright, railway accidents, Oct. 13
 Wright, gas governor, Oct. 27
 Wright, rolling steel, Aug. 9
 Wright, preparing fabrics, Jan. 28
 Wright, motive power, April 29
 Wright, anvils, Nov. 11
 Wright, raising skirts, Nov. 4
 Wright, anvils, Jan. 14
 Wrigley, coupling links, April 29
 Wrigley, spinning mules, Dec. 17
 Wyatt, wall coverings, June 14
 Yates, preparing wood, June 2
 Yates, vegetable fibre, June 20
 Young, fastenings, Jan. 25
 Young, door knobs, April 18
 Young, nobb and locks, Aug. 12
 Young, types, Sept. 22
 Zacheron, chimneys, July 26
 Zanni, electric machines, April 29
 Ziervogel, distilling, Mar. 25

POETRY.

IDYLLS OF THE KING.

(By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., *Poet Laureate.*)

ENID.

The brave Geraint, a knight of Arthur's court,
A tributary prince of Devon, one
Of that great order of the Table Round,
Had wedded Enid, Yniol's only child,
And loved her as he loved the light of Heaven;
And as the light of Heaven varies, now
At sunrise, now at sunset, now by night,
With moon and trembling stars, so loved Geraint
To make her beauty vary day by day,
In crimsons and in purples and in gems.
And Enid, but to please her husband's eye,
Who first had found and loved her in a state
Of broken fortunes, daily fronted him
In some fresh splendour; and the Queen herself,
Grateful to Prince Geraint for service done,
Loved her, and often with her own white hands
Array'd and decked her, as the loveliest,
Next after her own self, in all the court.
And Enid loved the Queen, and with true heart
Adored her, as the stateliest and the best
And loveliest of all women upon earth.

* * *

And while he waited in the castle court,
The voice of Enid, Yniol's daughter, rang
Clear thro' the open casement of the Hall,
Singing; and as the sweet voice of a bird,
Heard by the lander in a lonely isle,
Moves him to think what kind of bird it is
That sings so delicately clear, and make
Conjecture of the plumage and the form;
So the sweet voice of Enid moved Geraint,
And made him like a man abroad at morn
When first the liquid note beloved of men
Comes flying over many a windy wave
To Britain, and in April suddenly

Breaks from a coppice gemm'd with green and red,
 And he suspends his converse with a friend,
 Or it may be the labour of his hands,
 To think or say, "There is the nightingale;"
 So fared it with Geraint, who thought and said,
 "Here, by God's grace, is the one voice for me."

It chanced the song that Enid sang was one
 Of Fortune and her wheel, and Enid sang—

"Turn, Fortune, turn thy wheel and lower the proud;
 "Turn thy wild wheel through sunshine, storm, and cloud;
 "Thy wheel and thee we neither love nor hate.

"Turn, Fortune, turn thy wheel with smile or frown;
 "With that wild wheel we go not up or down;
 "Our hoard is little, but our hearts are great.

"Smile and we smile, the lords of many lands;
 "Frown and we smile, the lords of our own hands;
 "For man is man and master of his fate.

"Turn, turn thy wheel above the staring crowd;
 "Thy wheel and thou are shadows in the cloud;
 "Thy wheel and thee we neither love nor hate."

* * * * *

. . . and dismounting like a man
 That skins the wild beast after slaying him,
 Stript from the three dead wolves of woman born
 The three gay suits of armour which they wore,
 And let the bodies lie, but bound the suits
 Of armour on their horses, each on each,
 And tied the bridle reins of all the three
 Together, and said to her, "Drive them on
 Before you;" and she drove them thro' the waste.

He followed nearer; ruth began to work
 Against his anger in him, while he watch'd
 The being he loved best in all the world,
 With difficulty in mild obedience
 Driving them on; he fain had spoken to her,
 And loosed in words of sudden fire the wrath
 And smoulder'd wrong that burnt him all within;
 But evermore it seem'd an easier thing
 At once without remorse to strike her dead,
 Than to cry "Halt," and to her own bright face
 Accuse her of the least immodesty:
 And thus tongue-tied, it made him wroth the more
 That she could speak whom his own ear had heard
 Call herself false; and suffering thus he made
 Minutes an age.

* * * * *

Then Enid, in her utter helplessness,
 And since she thought, "he had not dared to do it,
 Except he surely knew my lord was dead,"
 Sent forth a sudden sharp and bitter cry,
 As of a wild thing taken in the trap,
 Which sees the trapper coming through the wood.
 This heard Geraint, and grasping at his sword
 (It lay beside him in the hollow shield),
 Made but a single bound, and with a sweep of it
 Shore thro' the swarthy neck, and like a ball
 The russet-bearded head roll'd on the floor.
 So died Earl Doorm by him he counted dead,
 And all the men and women in the hall
 Rose when they saw the dead man rise, and fled
 Yelling as from a spectre, and the two
 Were left alone together, and he said—
 "Enid, I have used you worse than that dead man;
 Done you more wrong: we both have undergone
 That trouble which has left me thrice your own;
 Henceforward I will rather die than doubt.
 And here I lay this penance on myself,
 Not, tho' mine own ears heard you yester-morn—
 You thought me sleeping, but I heard you say,
 I heard you say, that you were no true wife;
 I swear I will not ask your meaning in it;
 I do believe yourself against yourself,
 And will henceforward rather die than doubt."
 And Enid could not say one tender word,
 She felt so blunt and stupid at the heart;
 She only prayed him, "Fly, they will return
 And slay you; fly, your charger is without,
 My palfrey lost." "Then, Enid, you shall ride
 Behind me." "Yea," said Enid, "let us go!"
 And moving out they found the stately horse,
 Who, now no more a vassal to the thief,
 But free to stretch his limbs in lawful fight,
 Neigh'd with all gladness as they came, and stooped
 With a low whinny toward the pair; and she
 Kiss'd the white star upon his noble front,
 Glad also; then Geraint upon the horse
 Mounted, and reach'd a hand, and on his foot
 She set her own and climb'd; he turn'd his face
 And kiss'd her climbing, and she cast her arms
 About him, and at once they rode away.
 And never yet, since high in paradise
 O'er the four rivers the first roses blew,
 Came purer pleasure unto mortal kind
 Than lived thro' her, who in that perilous hour
 Put hand to hand beneath her husband's heart,

And felt him hers again ; she did not weep,
 But o'er her meek eyes came a happy mist
 Like that which kept the heart of Eden green
 Before the useful trouble of the rain.

VIVIEN.

The wily Vivien stole from Arthur's court :
 She hated all the knights, and heard in thought
 Their lavish comment when her name was named.
 For once, when Arthur walking all alone,
 Vext at a rumour rife about the Queen,
 Had met her, Vivien, being greeted fair,
 Would fain have wrought upon his cloudy mood
 With reverent eyes mock-loyal, shaken voice,
 And flutter'd adoration, and at last
 With dark sweet hints of some who prized him more
 Than who should prize him most ; at which the King
 Had gazed upon her blankly and gone by :
 But one had watch'd, and had not held his peace :
 It made the laughter of an afternoon
 That Vivien should attempt the blameless King.
 And after that, she set herself to gain
 Him, the most famous man of all those times,
 Merlin, who knew the range of all their arts,
 Had built the King his havens, ships, and halls,
 Was also Bard, and knew the starry heavens ;
 The people called him Wizard ; whom at first
 She play'd about with slight and sprightly talk,
 And vivid smiles, and faintly-venom'd points
 Of slander, glancing here and grazing there ;
 And yielding to his kindlier moods, the Seer
 Would watch her at her petulance, and play,
 Ev'n when they seem'd unloveable, and laugh
 As those that watch a kitten ; thus he grew
 Tolerant of what he half disdain'd, and she,
 Perceiving that she was but half disdain'd,
 Began to break her sports with graver fits,
 Turn red or pale, would often when they met
 Sigh fully, or all-silent gaze upon him
 With such a fixt devotion, that the old man,
 Tho' doubtful, felt the flattery, and at times
 Would flatter his own wish in age for love,
 And half believe her true ; for thus at times
 He waver'd ; but that other clung to him,
 Fixt in her will, and so the seasons went.

* * * * *

There lay she all her length and kiss'd his feet
 As if in deepest reverence and love.
 A twist of gold was round her hair; a robe
 Of samite without price, that more exprest
 Than hid her, clung about her lissome limbs,
 In colour like the satin-shining palm
 Or sallows in the windy gleam of March.
 And while she kiss'd them, crying, "Trample me,
 Dear feet, that I have follow'd thro' the world,
 And I will pay you worship; tread me down
 And I will kiss you for it;" he was mute:
 So dark a forethought roll'd about his brain,
 As on a dull day in an Ocean cave
 The blind wave feeling round his long sea-hall
 In silence: wherefore, when she lifted up
 A face of sad appeal, and spake and said
 "O Merlin, do you love me?" and again
 "O Merlin, do you love me?" and once more
 "Great Master, do you love me?" he was mute.
 And lissome Vivien, holding by his heel,
 Writhed toward him, slid up his knee and sat,
 Behind his ankle twined her hollow feet
 Together, curved an arm about his neck,
 Clung like a snake; and letting her left hand
 Droop from his mighty shoulder, as a leaf,
 Made with her right a comb of pearl to part
 The lists of such a beard as youth gone out
 Had left in ashes; then he spoke and said,
 Not looking at her, "Who are wise in love
 Love most, say least," and Vivien answered quick,
 "I saw the little elf-god eyeless once
 In Arthur's arras hall at Camelot;
 But neither eyes nor tongue—O stupid child!
 Yet you are wise who say it; let me think
 Silence is wisdom; I am silent then,
 And ask no kiss;" then adding all at once
 "And, lo, I clothe myself with wisdom," drew
 The vast and shaggy mantle of his beard
 Across her neck and bosom to her knee,
 And called herself a gilded summer fly
 Caught in a great old tyrant spider's web,
 Who meant to eat her up in that wild wood
 Without one word. So Vivien called herself
 But rather seemed a lovely baleful star
 Veil'd in grey vapour; till he sadly smiled:
 "To what request for what strange boon," he said,
 "Are these your pretty tricks and fooleries,
 O Vivien, the preamble? yet my thanks,
 For these have broken up my melancholy."

* * * * *

"But ere I leave you let me swear once more
That if I schemed against your peace in this,
May yon just heaven, that darkens o'er me, send
One flash, that, missing all things else, may make
My scheming brain a cinder, if I lie!"
Scarce had she ceased, when out of heaven a bolt
(For now the storm was close above them) struck,
Furrowing a giant oak, and javelining
With darted spikes and splinters of the wood
The dark earth round. He raised his eyes and saw
The tree that shone white-listed thro' the gloom.
But Vivien, fearing Heaven had heard her oath,
And dazzled by the livid-flickering fork,
And deafen'd with the stammering cracks and claps
That follow'd, flying back and crying out,
"O Merlin, tho' you do not love me, save,
Yet save me!" clung to him and hugg'd him close.
And call'd him dear protector in her fright,
Nor yet forgot her practice in her fright,
But wrought upon his mood and hugg'd him close.
The pale blood of the wizard at her touch
Took gayer colours, like an opal warm'd.
She blamed herself for telling hearsay tales :
She shook from fear, and for her fault she wept
Of petulancy; she call'd him lord and liege,
Her seer, her bard, her silver star of eve,
Her God, her Merlin, the one passionate love
Of her whole life; and ever overhead
Bellow'd the tempest, and the rotten branch
Snapt in the rushing of the river-rain
Above them; and in change of glare and gloom
Her eyes and neck glittering went and came;
Till now the storm, its burst of passion spent,
Moaning and calling out of other lands,
Had left the ravaged woodlands yet once more
To peace; and what should not have been had been,
For Merlin, overtalk'd and overworn,
Had yielded, told her all the charm, and slept.
Then, in one moment, she put forth the charm
Of woven paces and of waving hands,
And in the hollow oak he lay as dead,
And lost to life and use and name and fame.
Then crying, "I have made his glory mine."
And shrieking out, "O fool!" the harlot leapt
Adown the forest, and the thicket closed
Behind her, and the forest echo'd "fool!"

GUINEVERE.

So the stately Queen abode
 For many a week, unknown, among the nuns;
 Nor with them mix'd, nor told her name, nor sought,
 Wrapt in her grief, for housel or for shrift,
 But communed only with the little maid,
 Who pleased her with a babbling heedlessness
 Which often lured her from herself; but now,
 This night, a rumour wildly blown about
 Came, that Sir Modred had usurped the realm,
 And leagued him with the heathen, while the King
 Was waging war on Lancelot: then she thought,
 "With what a hate the people and the King
 Must hate me," and bow'd down upon her hands
 Silent, until the little maid, who brook'd
 No silence, brake it, uttering "Late! so late!
 What hour, I wonder, now?" and when she drew
 No answer, by-and-by began to hum
 An air the nuns had taught her; "Late, so late!"
 Which when she heard, the Queen look'd up, and said—
 "O maiden, if indeed you list to sing,
 Sing, and unbind my heart that I may weep."
 Whereat full willingly sang the little maid.

"Late, late, so late! and dark the night and chill!
 Late, late, so late! but we can enter still.
 Too late, too late! ye cannot enter now,

"No light had we: for that we do repent;
 And learning this, the bridegroom will relent.
 Too late, too late! ye cannot enter now.

"No light: so late! and dark and chill the night!
 O let us in, that we may find the light!
 Too late, too late: ye cannot enter now.

"Have we not heard the bridegroom is so sweet?
 O let us in, tho' late, to kiss his feet!
 No, no, too late! ye cannot enter now."

* * * * *

But when the Queen immersed in such a trance,
 And moving thro' the past unconsciously,
 Came to that point, when first she saw the King
 Ride toward her from the city, sigh'd to find
 Her journey done, glanced at him, thought him cold,
 High, self-contain'd, and passionless, not like him,
 "Not like my Lancelot"—while she brooded thus
 And grew half-guilty in her thoughts again,
 There rode an armed warrior to the doors.
 A murmuring whisper through the nunnery ran,

Then on a sudden a cry, "The King!" She sat
 Stiff-stricken, listening; but when armed feet
 Thro' the long gallery from the outer doors,
 Rang coming, prone from off her seat she fell,
 And grovell'd with her face against the floor :
 There with her milkwhite arms and shadowy hair
 She made her face a darkness from the King :
 And in the darkness heard his armed feet
 Pause by her ; then came silence, then a voice,
 Monotonous and hollow like a Ghost's
 Denouncing judgment, but though changed the King's.

"Liest thou here so low, the child of one
 I honour'd, happy, dead before thy shame ?
 Well is it that no child is born of thee.
 The children born of thee are sword and fire,
 Red ruin, and the breaking up of laws,
 The craft of kindred, and the Godless hosts
 Of heathen swarming o'er the Northern Sea.
 Whom I, while yet Sir Lancelot, my right arm,
 The mightiest of my knights, abode with me,
 Have everywhere about this land of Christ
 In twelve great battles ruining overthrown.
 And knowest thou now from whence I come—from him,
 From waging bitter war with him : and he,
 That did not shun to smite me in worse way,
 Had yet that grace of courtesy in him left,
 He spared to lift his hand against the King
 Who made him knight : but many a knight was slain ;
 And many more, and all his kith and kin
 Clave to him, and abode in his own land.
 And many more when Modred raised revolt,
 Forgetful of their troth and fealty, clave
 To Modred, and a remnant stays with me.
 And of this remnant will I leave a part,
 True men who love me still, for whom I live,
 To guard thee in the wild hour coming on,
 Lest but a hair of this low head be harm'd.
 Fear not : thou shalt be guarded till my death.
 Howbeit I know, if ancient prophecies
 Have err'd not, that I march to meet my doom.
 Thou hast not made my life so sweet to me,
 That I the King should greatly care to live ;
 For thou hast spoilt the purpose of my life.
 Bear with me for the last time while I show,
 Ev'n for thy sake, the sin which thou hast sinn'd.
 For when the Roman left us, and their law
 Relax'd its hold upon us, and the ways
 Were fill'd with rapine, here and there a deed
 Of prowess done redress'd a random wrong.
 But I was first of all the kings who drew

The knighthood-errant of this realm and all
The realms together under me, their Head,
In that fair order of my Table Round,
A glorious company, the flower of men,
To serve as model for the mighty world,
And be the fair beginning of a time.
I made them lay their hands in mine and swear
To reverence the King, as if he were
Their conscience, and their conscience as their King,
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ,
To ride abroad redressing human wrongs,
To speak no slander—no, nor listen to it,
To lead sweet lives in purest chastity,
To love one maiden only, cleave to her,
And worship her by years of noble deeds,
Until they won her; for indeed I knew
Of no more subtle master under heaven
Than is the maiden passion for a maid,
Not only to keep down the base in man,
But teach high thought, and amiable words,
And courtliness, and the desire of fame,
And love of truth, and all that makes a man.
And all this throve until I wedded thee!
Believing 'lo mine helpmate, one to feel
My purpose and rejoicing in my joy.'
Then came thy shameful sin with Lancelot;
Then came the sin of Tristram and Isolt;
Then others, following these my mightiest knights,
And drawing foul ensample from fair names,
Sinn'd also, till the loathsome opposite
Of all my heart had destined did obtain,
And all thro' thee! so that this life of mine
I guard as God's high gift from scathe and wrong,
Nor greatly care to lose; but rather think
How sad it were for Arthur, should he live,
To sit once more within his lonely hall,
And miss the wonted number of my knights,
And miss to hear high talk of noble deeds
As in the golden days before thy sin.
For which of us, who might be left, could speak
Of the pure heart, nor seem to glance at thee?
And in thy bowers of Camelot or of Usk
'Thy shadow still would glide from room to room,
And I should evermore be vexed with thee
In hanging robe or vacant ornament,
Or ghostly footfall echoing on the stair.
For think not, tho' thou wouldst not love thy lord,
Thy lord has wholly lost his love for thee.
I am not made of so slight elements,

Yet must I leave thee, woman, to thy shame.
 I hold that man the worst of public foes
 Who either for his own or children's sake,
 To save his blood from scandal, lets the wife
 Whom he knows false, abide and rule the house :
 For being thro' his cowardice allow'd
 Her station, taken everywhere for pure,
 She like a new disease, unknown to men,
 Creeps, no precaution used, among the crowd,
 Makes wicked lightnings of her eyes, and saps
 The fealty of our friends, and stirs the pulse
 With devil's leaps, and poisons half the young.
 Worst of the worst were that man be that reigns !
 Better the King's waste hearth and aching heart
 Than thou reseated in thy place of light,
 The mockery of my people and their bane."

He paused, and in the pause she crept an inch
 Nearer, and laid her hands about his feet.
 Far off a solitary trumpet blew.
 Then waiting by the doors the warhorse neigh'd
 As at a friend's voice, and he spake again.
 "Yet think not that I come to urge thy crimes,
 I did not come to curse thee, Guinevere,
 I, whose vast pity also makes me die
 To see thee, laying there thy golden head,
 My pride in happier summers, at my feet.
 The wrath which forced my thoughts on that fierce law,
 The doom of treason and the flaming death,
 (When first I learnt thee hidden here) is past.
 The pang—which while I weigh'd thy heart with one
 Too wholly true to dream untruth in thee,
 Made my tears burn—is also past, in part.
 And all is past, the sin is sinn'd, and I,
 Lo ! I forgive thee, as Eternal God
 Forgives : do thou for thine own soul the rest.
 But how to take last leave of all I loved ?
 O golden hair with which I used to play,
 Not knowing ! O imperial-moulded form,
 And beauty such as never woman wore,
 Until it came a kingdom's curse with thee—
 I cannot touch thy lips, they are not mine,
 But Lancelot's : nay, they never were the King's.
 I cannot take thy hand ; that too is flesh,
 And in the flesh thou hast sinned ; and mine own flesh
 Here looking down on thine polluted, cries
 'I loathe thee.' yet not less, O Guinevere,
 For I was ever virgin save for thee,
 My love thro' flesh hath wrought into my life

So far, that my doom is, I love thee still.
 Let no man dream but that I love thee still,
 Perchance, and so thou purify thy soul,
 And so thou lean on our fair father Christ,
 Hereafter in that world where all are pure
 We two may meet before high God, and thou
 Wilt spring to me, and claim me thine, and know
 I am thine husband—not a smaller soul,
 Nor Lancelot, nor another. Leave me that,
 I charge thee, my last hope. Now must I hence.
 Thro' the thick night I hear the trumpet blow :
 They summon me their King to lead mine hosts
 Far down to that great battle in the west,
 Where I must strike against my sister's son,
 Leagued with the lords of the White Horse and knights,
 Once mine, and strike him dead, and meet myself
 Death, or I know not what mysterious doom.
 And thou remaining here wilt learn the event;
 But hither shall I never come again,
 Never lie by thy side, see thee no more,
 Farewell !"

And while she grovell'd at his feet,
 She felt the King's breath wander o'er her neck,
 And, in the darkness o'er her fallen head,
 Perceived the waving of his hands that blest.

Then, listening till those armed steps were gone,
 Rose the pale Queen, and in her anguish found
 The casement: "peradventure" so she thought,
 "If I might see his face, and not be seen."
 And lo, he sat on horseback at the door !
 And near him the sad nuns with each a light
 Stood, and he gave them charge about the Queen,
 To guard and foster her for evermore.
 And while he spake to these his helm was lower'd,
 To which for crest the golden dragon clung
 Of Britain ; so she did not see the face,
 Which then was as an angel's, but she saw,
 Wet with the mists and smitten by the lights,
 The Dragon of the great Pendragonship
 Blaze, making all the night a steam of fire.
 And even then he turn'd ; and more and more
 The moony vapour rolling round the King,
 Who seem'd the phantom of a Giant in it,
 Enwound him fold by fold, and made him gray.
 And grayer, till himself became as mist
 Before her, moving ghostlike to his doom.

RIFLEMEN, FORM!

(From "THE TIMES.")

There is a sound of thunder afar,
 Storm in the South that darkens the day,
 Storm of battle and thunder of war,
 Well, if it do not roll our way.
 Storm! Storm! Riflemen, form!
 Ready, be ready to meet the storm!
 Riflemen! Riflemen! Riflemen, form!

 Be not deaf to the sound that warns!
 Be not gull'd by a despot's plea!
 Are figs of thistles or grapes of thorns?
 How should a despot set men free?
 Form! form! Riflemen, form!
 Ready, be ready to meet the storm!
 Riflemen! Riflemen! Riflemen, form!

 Let your Reforms for a moment go,
 Look to your butts and take good aims.
 Better a rotten borough or so,
 Than a rotten fleet or a city in flames!
 Form! form! Riflemen, form!
 Ready, be ready to meet the storm!
 Riflemen! Riflemen! Riflemen, form!

 Form! be ready to do or die!
 Form in Freedom's name and the Queen's!
 True, that we have a faithful ally,
 But only the Devil knows what he means.
 Form! form! Riflemen, form!
 Ready, be ready to meet the storm!
 Riflemen! Riflemen! Riflemen, form!
A. T. (Alfred Tennyson?)

ROBERT BURNS.

*Prize Poem on the Centenary Anniversary of the Birth of Burns.**(By ISABELLA CRAIG.)*

We hail this morn,
 A century's noblest birth;
 A Poet peasant-born,
 Who more of Fame's immortal dower
 Unto his country brings,
 Than all her Kings!

As lamps high set
Upon some earthly eminence,—
And to the gazer brighter thence
Than the sphere-lights they flout,—
Dwindle in distance and die out,
While no star waneth yet;
So through the past far-reaching night,
Only the star-souls keep their light.

A gentle boy,—
With moods of sadness and of mirth,
Quick tears and sudden joy,—
Grew up beside the peasant's hearth.
His father's toil he shares;
But half his mother's cares,
From his dark searching eyes,
Too swift to sympathize,
Hid in her heart she bears.

At early morn,
His father calls him to the field;
Through the stiff soil that clogs his feet,
Chill rain and harvest heat,
He plods all day; returns at eve, outworn,
To the rude fare a peasant's lot doth yield;—
To what else was he born?

The God made King
Of every living thing
(For his great heart in love could hold them all);
The dumb eyes meeting his by hearth and stall,—
Gifted to understand!—
Knew it and sought his hand;
And the most timorous creature had not fled,
Could she his heart have read,
Which fain all feeble things had bless'd and sheltered.

To Nature's feast—
Who knew her noblest guest
And entertained him best—
Kingly he came. Her chambers of the East
She drap'd with crimson and with gold,
And pour'd her pure joy-wines
For him the poet-soul'd.
For him her anthem roll'd,
From the storm-wind among the winter pines,
Down to the slenderest note
Of a love warble, from the linnet's throat.

But when begins
The array for battle, and the trumpet blows,
A King must leave the feast, and lead the fight.

And with its mortal foes,—
 Grim gathering hosts of sorrow and of sins,—
 Each human soul must close,
 And Fame her trumpet blew
 Before him ; wrapp'd him in her purple state ;
 And made him mark for all the shafts of fate
 That henceforth round him flew.

Though he may yield
 Hard-press'd, and wounded fall
 Forsaken on the field ;
 His regal vestments soil'd ;
 His crown of half its jewels spoil'd ;
 He is a king for all.
 Had he but stood aloof !
 Had he array'd himself in armour proof
 Against temptation's darts !
 So yearn the good ;—so those the world calls wise,
 With vain presumptuous hearts,
 Triumphant moralize.

Of martyr-woe
 A sacred shadow on his memory rests ;
 Tears have not ceased to flow ;
 Indignant grief yet stirs impetuous breasts,
 To think,—above that noble soul brought low,
 That wise and soaring spirit fool'd, enslav'd,—
 Thus, thus he had been sav'd !

It might not be !
 That heart of harmony
 Had been too rudely rent ;
 Its silver chords, which any hand could wound,
 By no hand could be tun'd,
 Save by the maker of the instrument,
 Its every string who knew,
 And from profaning touch his heavenly gift withdrew.

Regretful love
 His country fain would prove,
 By grateful honours lavish'd on his grave ;
 Would fain redeem her blame
 That he so little at her hands can claim,
 Who unrewarded gave
 To her his life-bought gift of song and fame.

The land he trod
 Hath now become a place of pilgrimage ;
 Where dearer are the daisies of the sod
 That could his song engage.
 The hoary hawthorn, wreath'd
 Above the bank on which his limbs he flung

While some sweet plaint he breath'd ;
The streams he wander'd near ;
The maidens whom he lov'd ; the songs he sung ;
All, all are dear.

The arch blue eyes,—
Arch but for love's disguise,—
Of Scotland's daughters, soften at his strain ;
Her hardy sons, sent forth across the main
To drive the ploughshare through earth's virgin soils,
Lighten with it their toils ;
And sister lands have learned to love the tongue
In which such songs are sung.

For doth not Song
To the whole world belong ?
Is it not given wherever tears can fall,
Wherever hearts can melt, or blushes glow,
Or mirth and sadness mingle as they flow,
A heritage to all ? ”

INDEX.

N.B. The figures between [] refer to the History.

ACCIDENTS.—Terrible accident at the Polytechnic Institution, 5; fall of a shop at Liverpool, five lives lost, 7; fall of houses in Kentish-town, 8; destruction of the Crinan Canal, 12; steamboat explosion at Cardiff, nine lives lost, 16; explosion of the Hounslow powder-mills, seven lives lost, 36; singular death of a Bank official, 47; dreadful boiler explosion at Dundee, 33 persons killed or injured, 49; at the Westminster Palace Hotel, seven persons killed, 61; singular accident by a fly-wheel, 68; fatal boat accident in the Bristol Channel, 83; to a man-of-war's boat in Belfast Harbour, thirteen persons drowned, 92; explosion of a percussion-cap factory at Birmingham, three persons killed, 114; explosion of another percussion-cap factory, 21 persons killed, 145; four persons burnt to death, 119; explosion of the Ballincollig powder-mills, five persons killed, 119; destruction of Walton Bridge, 123; fatal accident to an aeronaut, 124; explosion on board H.M.S. *Pioneer*, 129; fatal boat accidents in Ireland, 134; terrible explosion on board the *Great Eastern*, 136; fatal explosion of a steam-engine at Lewes, 142; explosion of a steam-tug in Kingroad, 143; explosion and loss of life at Ballisodare, Sligo, 168.

Railway Accidents.—On the North Western Railway, near Lymington, 18; terrible railway accidents in America—on the Great Western Railway of Canada, at Chicago, on the Michigan Southern, 28; at the Grove Lake Viaduct, Cornwall Railway, 60; on the Bangor and Carnarvon Railway, 68; on the London and Blackwall Railway, 116; on the Great Northern Railway, near Hitchin, 135; on the South Coast Railway, 177; railway and steamboat disasters in America, 201; return of railway accidents in the year 1859, 202.

Colliery Accidents.—At the Agecroft colliery, and at Wolverhampton, 6; at

Accidents—*continued.*

the Mair colliery, Neath, 26 lives lost, 43; at Star-green colliery, 20 persons killed or wounded, 167.

ACTS, LIST OF, 22 VICT.—i. Public General Acts, 276; ii. Local and Personal Acts, 277; iii. Private Act *printed*, 279; iv. Private Act *not printed*, 279.

ACTS, LIST OF, 22 & 23 VICT.—i. Public General Acts, 280; ii. Local and Personal Acts, 282; iii. Private Acts *printed*, 288; iv. Private Acts *not printed*, 289.

Antiquities.—Excavations at *Uriconium*, or Wroxeter, 164.

[See Sales of Pictures, Coins, &c.]

Arctic Expedition.—Discovery of the fate of Sir John Franklin's Expedition, by Captain M'Clintock, 143.

Asia Minor.—Earthquake in, Erzeroum destroyed, 77.

BANKRUPTS, Table of, in the year 1859, 310.

BIRTHS, 377.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS, Summary of, from 1850 to 1859, 310.

Burns, Robert, celebration of the centenary anniversary of the birth of, 9. Prize poem on the occasion by Miss Isabella Craig, **POETRY, 556.**

CHINA.—Mr. Bruce appointed minister plenipotentiary; his instructions, [262]; arrives at Hong Kong; evasive delays of the Chinese; English and French ambassadors proceed to the Peiho river, [263]; attempt to enter the river; action with the forts, and disastrous defeat of our force, [264]; Chinese account of the action, [266]; the squadron returns to Shanghai, [268].

Treaty between Her Majesty and the Emperor of China, signed at Tien-tsin June 26, 1858, 206.

Despatch of Admiral Hope, detailing the action at the mouth of the Peiho, 267; Chinese official account of the same, 273.

Colliery Accidents.—At the Agecroft colliery, and at Wolverhampton, 6; at the Mair colliery, Neath, 26 lives lost,

INDEX.

Colliery Accidents—*continued.*

43; at Star-green colliery, 20 persons killed or wounded, 167.

CORN, HAY, STRAW, CLOVER, AND BUTCHER'S MEAT, Average prices of, in the year, 309.

DEATHS.—Table of Mortality in England and Wales, and in the Metropolis, in the year 1859, 310.

DEATHS.—Abrantes, duke of, 406; Addison, J. 406; Alexander, sir R. 406; Alexander, prof. 406; Alexander, H. 406; Alison, prof. 406; Allen, lieutenant-col. 407; Alsager, H. 407; Anderson, capt. 407; Andrews, alderm. 407; Annesley, J. 407; Anson, maj. O. H. 407; Antigua, bp. of, 407; Arkwright, R. 408; Arnold, W. D. 408; Aston, sir A. J. 408; Atkins, E. M. 408; Austen, col. 409; Aylesford, earl of, 409; Aytoun, mrs. J. E. W. 409.

Bacon, J. 409; Baillie, miss C. R. 409; Baker, vice-adm. sir H. L. 409; Baker, R. 409; Baldwin, C. B. 409; Bangor, bp. of, 410; Bankhead, C. 409; Barclay, sir R. 409; Barclay, lady, 409; Barnes, rev. dr. 409; Bartlett, J. 409; Bateson, miss A. 409; Baynes, maj. 409; Becher, lieutenant-col. C. G. 409; Beioley, J. 409; Bell, Jacob, 409; Bellamy, T. J. 410; Bennett, mr. 410; Berens, archd. 410; Bessouett, J. 410; Bethell, bp. 410; Bevan, rev. F. S. 410; Bickersteth, mrs. S. 410; Black, lieutenant-col. 410; Blackett, lady, 410; Blair, lady, 410; Blanshard, maj.-gen. 410; Blunt, gen. 411; Bombay, archd. of, 475; Bowen, bp. 411; Bonham, lady, 411; Booth, J. R. 411; Bosio, mad. 411; Bouchier, lieutenant-gen. 411; Bouverie, mrs. S. M. 411; Bowyer, rear-adm. 411; Boyle, rear-adm. 411; Bray, col. 411; Bray, S. 411; Brecon, archd. of, 420; Brenton, vice-adm. 411; Brett, maj. 411; Bridge, J. 412; Bridges, lady, 412; Bristol, marq. of, 412; Broderip, W. J. 412; Brooke, A. J. 412; Brough, gen. 412; Browne, mrs. E. P. 412; Browne, W. K. 412; Brueys, mad. 412; Brunel, I. K. 412; Bryan, mrs. E. 414; Bulman, J. 414; Burke, lady, 414; Burns, rev. dr. 414; Bute, marchioness of, 414; Butler, lady, 414; Burnet, lady M. 414.

Calder, mrs. S. L. 414; Callcott, miss M. H. 415; Calvert, hon. F. 415; Cameron, D. 415; Camidge, dr. 415; Campbell, hon. R. 415; Campbell, lieutenant-col. D. 415; Campbell, lieutenant-col. P. 415; Campbell, lieutenant. A. 415;

Deaths—*continued.*

Camperdown, earl of, 415; Cardew, lieutenant-gen. 415; Carnac, lady, 415; Carnegie, miss J. 416; Carr, rev. dr. 416; Carter, mrs. H. J. 416; Castle-stuart, dow. cntss. of, 416; Cathcart, earl, 416; Cator, J. 416; Cavendish, rev. T. U. 416; Chalmers, D. 416; Chalmier, rev. W. 416; Chandler, rev. dr. 417; Chaplin, W. J. 416; Charleville, earl of, 417; Chesshyre, rev. W. J. 417; Chetwode, lady, 417; Chichester, dean of, 417; Clapham, T. 417; Clark, dr. W. 417; Clark, T. 417; Clarke, lieutenant-col. 417; Clarke, N. R. 417; Clarke, miss J. 417; Cleveland, duchess of, 418; Clive, hon. R. W. 418; Clough, dean, 418; Clutterbuck, lieutenant. C. 418; Cockburn, dow. lady, 418; Collins, W. 418; Collins, J. S. 418; Collingwood, lieutenant. 418; Conant, miss F. 418; Courtenay, W. 418; Courtown, cntss. dow. of, 418; Cox, David, 418; Crabbe, col. 418; Crawshaw, R. 419; Crispe, miss A. 419; Croft, miss M. A. 419; Crowder, sir R. B. 419; Cummins, R. Y. 419; Cunliffe, gen. sir R. H. 419; Cunningham, mrs. M. 419; Curtis, R. W. 419; Curtis, dr. 419; Curzon, hon. miss E. 419; Cushman, Susan, 464.

Damer, hon. W. M. D. 419; Darwin, sir F. S. 419; Dashwood, mrs. L. H. 419; Daubeney, miss C. S. 420; Davies, archd. 420; Dawson, P. 420; Dawson, E. 420; Deagon, E. 420; De Grey, earl, 426; Delamere, lady, 420; Denison, mrs. C. 420; Devon, earl of, 420; Dickinson, maj. gen. 420; Digby, mrs. A. E. 420; Disraeli, miss S. 420; Dixon, D. 420; Domville, lady, 420; Douglas, lord W. 420; Douglas, rev. H. 421; Dowse, R. R. 421; Doyle, J. 421; Drummond, col. E. 421; Duberly, lady, 421; Duff, lady, 421; Duncan, gen. 421; Dunn, vice-adm. sir D. 421; Durham, bp. of, 456.

Edwards, lady, 421; Elphinstone, hon. Mountstuart, 421; Elwes, G. C. 422; Ely, archd. of, 431; Erskine, dean, 422; Eveleigh, gen. 422; Eyre, maj. gen. sir W. 422.

Fairlie, sir C. C. 423; Farley, C. 423; Farnaby, rev. sir C. F. 423; Fawcett, col. W. 423; Feilden, J. 423; Fenwick, R. W. 423; Fergusson, R. C. 423; Ferrers, earl, 423; Ferris, vice-adm. 423; Filmer, rev. F. 423; Finch, rev. C. 423; Fincham, J. 424; Fitch, W. S. 424; Fitzgerald, col. 424; Fitzgerald, mrs. C. M. 424; Fitzgerald, capt. 424; FitzRoy, rt. hon. H. 424;

O O

VOL. CI.

INDEX.

Deaths—continued.

Forbes, lady G. 424; Forbes, C. H. 424; Fortescue, hon. J. W. 424; Fortescue, H. E. 424; Foster, R. 424; Fraser, col. 424; Freeborn, mr., 424; Freeman, mrs. C. 489; Frere, rev. T. 424; Frere, mrs. J. 425; Proude, archd. 425; Fryer, J. 425; Furley, W. H. 425.

Garrick, mrs. 425; George, E. 425; Gilmour, lieut.-gen. 425; Goldsmid, sir I. L. 425; Goodman, sir G. 425; Gore, hon. W. 425; Goring, sir H. D. 425; Gosselin, gen. G. 425; Grace, vice-adm. 425; Graham, dow. lady, 425; Granger, H. G. 425; Grant, rear-adm. sir R. 425; Grant, sir T. T. 425; Grant, sir J. 426; Grattan, H. 426; Graves, lieut. 426; Greaves, II. M. 426; Grey, rev. dr. 427; Grey, miss, 427; Grimes, E. 427; Grimm, W. 427; Gross, C. 427; Groves, maj. 427.

Haig, mrs. 427; Hall, H. 427; Hall, C. 427; Hallan, H. 427; Hamilton, dow. duchess of, 430; Hamilton, W. R. 430; Hampden, mrs. M. G. 431; Hancock, hon. E. 431; Harborough, earl of, 431; Hardwick, archd. 431; Harewood, cntss. dow. of, 432; Harley, miss E. P. 432; Harris, Frances, 432; Harrowby, cntss. of, 432; Hartwell, lady, 432; Hastings, lord, 432; Hatton, rear-adm. 433; Hay, lady Leith, 433; Hay, maj.-gen. 433; Head, J. 433; Henfrey, prof. 433; Henry, T. H. 433; Heygate, lady I. 433; Hicks, C. W. 433; Hindmarsh, miss A. 434; Hindmarsh, lady, 434; Hine, J. 434; Hoche, mdme. 434; Hodder, W. H. M. 434; Hodge, rev. C. V. 434; Holden, H. G. 434; Holland, lord, 434; Holland, hon. mrs. F. 435; Holt, rear-adm. 435; Horsfield, T. 435; Hotham, lady, 435; Howard, hon. mrs. H. 435; Hubback, mrs. F. 435; Hudleston, col. R. J. 435; Hughes, J. 435; Hughes, J. H. 435; Humboldt, F. H. A. 435; Hunt, Leigh, 438; Hunter, lady, 441.

Inglis, lieut. H. L. T. 440; Inman, rev. J. 440; Irving, Washington, 440; Irwin, archd. 441.

James, rev. Angell, 441; Jejeebhoy, sir Jamsetjee, 442; Jellachich, count, 442; Jenkinson, mrs. A. H. 443; Jerdan, W. F. 443; Jerningham, hon. mrs. E. S. 443; Jerrold, mrs. 443; Jersey, earl of, 443; Jersey, earl of, 444; Johnson, M. J. 444; Johnstone,

Deaths—continued.

rev. V. B. 445; Johnstone, hon. mrs. 445; Jones, dow. lady, 445.

Keane, hon. mrs. 445; Kennedy, hon. J. 445; Kennedy, lieut.-gen. 445; Kennedy, J. 445; Keppel, hon. lady, 445; Key, lady, 445; King, mrs. S. 445; Kirkwood, lieut.-col. 445; Knesbeck, baron, 445; Koch, Christian, 445; Krasinski, count S. 445; Krehmer, chev. 446.

Lajatico, marq. of, 446; Lane, S. 446; Lardner, dr. 446; Larois, R. 447; Laurie, prof. 447; Laws, rear-adm. 447; Lawson, capt. 447; Lee, rev. dr. 448; Lee, J. 448; Lee, J. 448; Leeds, duke of, 448; Lefroy, mrs. E. 449; Legh, lieut.-col. 449; Leinster, duchess of, 449; Leith, gen. sir A. 449; Leslie, C. R. 449; Leslie, hon. mrs. G. M. 450; Lewis, lieut.-gen. 450; Lawson, miss S. D. 450; Lloyd, capt. H. 450; Listowell, dow. cntss. of, 450; Livingstone, sir A. 450; Lloyd, mrs. M. K. 451; Longman, J. T. 451; Labouchere, mrs. 451; Lovell, vice-adm. 451; Lumley, lady, 451; Lushington, gen. sir J. L. 451; Lynch, P. 451; Lyne, L. S. 451; Lysaght, adm. 451.

Macadam, maj.-gen. 451; Macan, judge, 451; Macaskill, lady, 451; Macaulay, lord, 451; Macaulay, sir J. 455; Mackay, A. 456; Maclean, lieut.-col. A. 456; Maclean, W. F. 456; MacCormack, lieut. 456; MacInnes, gen. 456; McKenna, capt. 456; Maginn, mrs. E. R. 456; Maltby, bp. 456; Martin, J. W. 457; Martley, H. 457; Mason, H. W. 457; Matterson, P. 457; Maude, hon. miss J. E. 457; Maule, hon. W. 457; Mayo, mrs. L. 457; Mends, lady, 457; Menteath, miss S. 457; Meredyth, sir H. 457; Metternich, prince, 457; Mills, W. 459; Mills, mrs. L. B. 459; Minto, earl of, 459; Mitford, rev. J. 461; Molesworth, maj.-gen. 461; Monro, A. 461; Montagu, lady, 461; Montmorency, H. de, 461; Montrosor, lieut.-col. 461; Moore, mrs. E. J. 461; Moray, earl of, 461; Morgan, lady S. 461; Morison, rev. J. 463; Morse, lieut.-gen. 463; Mosley, lady, 463; Moysey, archd. 463; Mullings, J. R. 463; Murray, lord, 463; Murray, hon. maj. C. 464; Murray, lady, 464; Musgrave, sir R. 464; Musgrave, P. 464; Muspratt, mrs. S. C. 464.

Naples, king of, 464; Neill, col. 465; Neville, mrs. G. 465; Newport, rev. sir

INDEX.

Deaths—continued.

J. 465; Nichol, prof. 465; Nicholas, B. T. 465; Norbury, cntss. dow. of, 465; Norris, sir W. 466; Northwick, lord, 466; Norton, Fl. 466; Nugent, sir J. 466.

O'Connor, lady, 466; Ogilvy, lieutenant. 466; Ogle, sir C. 466; O'Grady, archd. 466; Oliphant, sir A. 467; Ollier, C. 467; Olliffe, ✱ bishop, 467; Orme, C. 467; Osborne, mrs. E. 467; Ossory, archd. of, 441; Oxenden, W. D. 467; D'Oyley, mrs. M. F. 467.

Packe, lieutenant. col. 467; Paget, mrs. S. 467; Parkinson, W. H. 467; Pashley, R. 467; Peddie, lt.-col. 468; Peel, lady, 468; Peirse, H. W. 468; Pellew, hon. maj. B. 468; Pennant, mrs. E. 468; Pennefather, rt. hon. R. 468; Percival, S. 468; Perrott, sir E. B. 468; Phillips, C. 468; Philipps, rev. E. T. M. 469; Pickernell, comm. 469; Pigott, mrs. M. 469; Pinckney, col. 469; Pipon, maj. 469; Pitcairn, sir J. 469; Placentia, duke of, 469; Plunket, hon. P. 469; Polwarth, lady, 469; Porter, W. E. 469; Portugal, queen of, 469; Pratt, lieutenant. col. 469; Predder, sir J. L. 469; Prendergast, M. 469; Pretymann, rev. G. 469; Prescott, W. H. 470; Pringle, vice-adm. 471; Pritchard, W. 471; Proby, rev. C. 471; Proctor, lady, 471; Proctor, lieutenant. gen. 471; Prosser, col. 471; Prout, T. 471; Pulman, J. 472.

Quale, maj. 472; De Quincey, T. 472.

Raitt, col. E. 474; Ramsay, lady, 475; Reynolds, archd. 475; Ricardo, W. 475; Richards, S. 475; Richards, rev. T. W. 475; Richardson, O. G. 475; Ricketts, lady, 475; Riddle, rev. J. E. 475; Rigaud, bishop, 407; Ripon, earl of, 475; Ripon, dean of, 422; Ripplingille, E. V. 477; Ritchie, D. 477; Robb, capt. 477; De Robeck, dow. baroness, 477; Roberts, lieutenant. gen. 477; Roots, W. 477; Roper, J. 477; Rose, col. 477; Rothes, earl of, 477; De Rothschild, baroness A. 477; Rowe, sir W. C. 477; Rowland, D. 477; Russell, gen. sir J. 478; Russell, M. P. 478.

Sandwich, cntss. of, 489; St. John, B. 478; St. Quintin, W. 474; St. Vincent, visct. 478; Sapieha, princess A. 478; De Sausmarez, capt. 479; Du Sautoy, J. 479; Du Sautoy, F. 479; Savage, T. 479; Scott, lady, 479; Scott, dr. 479; Scudamore, mrs. 479; Sebright, lady, 479; Selby, mrs. L. T.

Deaths—continued.

479; Seymour, lord H. 479; Seymour, lieutenant. col. 480; Shank, H. 480; Sharland, J. 480; Sharpe, rev. J. 480; Shaw, rev. J. 480; Shepherd, J. 480; Shiffner, adm. sir H. 480; Shirley, mrs. E. 480; Sibley, lieutenant. col. 480; Sierra Leone, bp. of, 411; Sim, W. 480; Simpson, J. 480; Simpson, J. 480; Sinclair, capt. 480; Sivewright, J. 480; Skipworth, G. 480; Slade, gen. sir J. 480; Slater, J. 481; Slaughter, mrs. F. 481; Sligo, marchess. of, 481; Smedley, F. 481; Smith, Abel, 481; Smith, lieutenant. col. 482; Smith, sir M. C. 482; Smith, J. G. 482; Smith, mrs. A. 482; Smyth, mrs. A. 482; Sockett, rev. T. 482; Spens, maj. gen. A. 482; Spohr, dr. 482; Stanhope, lady, 483; St. Asaph, dean of, 418; Staunton, sir G. T. 483; Steel, brig. 483; Steinkopff, rev. C. F. A. 483; De Sternberg, baroness, 483; Stephen, rt. hon. sir J. 483; Stephenson, R. 484; Stewardson, T. 487; Stisted, lieutenant. col. 487; Stokes, lieutenant. col. 487; Stokes, R. 488; Stone, Frank, 488; Stradling, W. 488; Strangways, hon. G. C. F. 488; Stuart, lord P. 488; Stuart, hon. mrs. 488; Sturge, J. 488; Suckling, lieutenant. col. 489; Suffield, dow. lady, 489; Surtees, A. 489; Surtees, J. 489; Sweden, king of, 489.

De Tabley, dow. lady, 489; Tait, col. 489; Tankerville, earl of, 489; Tattersall, R. 490; Taylor, lady S. 490; Taylor, J. 490; Taylor, mrs. 490; Teesdale, lady, 490; Tempest, col. 490; Thackwell, lieutenant. gen. sir J. 490; Theobald, T. 491; Thompson, D. J. 491; Thornton, rear. adm. 491; Tindal, mrs. E. 491; De Tocqueville, A. C. H. 491; Tollemache, W. J. F. 491; Tothill, maj. gen. 491; Towers, maj. gen. 492; Trafford, T. 492; Trench, gen. sir F. W. 492; Turville, G. F. 492; Trimmer, rev. H. S. 492; Trimmer, mrs. M. D. 492; Trotter, rear. adm. 492.

Udny, col. 492.

Vansittart, capt. N. 492; Vansittart, A. 492; Vaughan, sir R. W. 492; Vesey, mrs. M. 492; Vizard, W. 492.

Waldegrave, earl of, 492; Walford, comm. 493; Walhouse, miss, 493; Walker, lady, 493; Walker, W. K. 493; Walker, J. 493; Wallinger, capt. 493; Walpole, hon. col. 493; Walsh, G. D. 493; Walter, rev. H. 493; Ward, capt. 494; Ward, G. 494; Ward, J.

INDEX.

Deaths—*continued.*

494; Wardle, H. 494; Warren, sir H. 494; Warrington, col. 494; Waterford, marq. of, 494; Watson, miss E. 494; Watson, rev. J. 494; Watts, vice-adm. 494; Wawn, J. T. 494; Way, B. 494; Welsh, J. 494; Wesley, rev. dr. 494; Westmorland, earl of, 495; Wetherell, J. 496; Wheler, lady, 496; Wigney, mrs. A. 496; Wilde, sir J. 496; Wildman, col. 496; Wilkins, mrs. S. 496; Willan, mrs. L. 496; Willaume, E. T. 496; Wilbraham, E. 496; Williams, lady, 496; Willson, G. S. 496; Wilson, prof. G. 496; Wingfield, col. 497; Winterbottom, dr. 497; Wise, comm. 497; Wodehouse, W. T. 497; Wodehouse, comm. 497; Wolfe, R. B. 497; Wolff, lady G. M. 497; Wolridge, lieut. H. 497; Wordsworth, mrs. 497; Wright, E. 499; Wyndham, miss C. 499; Wyndham, mrs. M. F. 499.

Yelverton, hon. miss M. 499; Yeh, commissioner, 499; Young, hon. mrs. P. 499.

DENMARK.—Submarine telegraph between Cromer and Denmark, 100.

DESPATCHES.—Despatch of Admiral Hope, detailing the action at the mouth of the Peiho, 267; Chinese official account of the same, 273.

ELECTION, THE GENERAL.—*See* GENERAL ELECTION.

ENGLAND.—Principal subjects of public interest at the opening of the year; Parliamentary Reform and our foreign relations [2]; prospects of the Derby Ministry [3]; Parliament opened by the Queen in person; Her Majesty's Speech [3]. [*See* PARLIAMENT].

Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 56.

FINANCE ACCOUNTS for the Year 1859.—Class i. Public Income, 290; ii. Public Expenditure, 292; iii. Consolidated Fund, 296; iv. Public Funded Debt, 294; v. Unfunded Debt, 297; vi. Disposition of Grants, 298; vii. Trade and Navigation, 305.

Fires.—Great conflagration at Valparaiso, 3; great fire at Sheffield, 10; at Nottingham, 12; fire and loss of life in Whitechapel, 15; fatal fires in Marylebone, 17; destruction of King's Newton Hall, 50; great fire at Bristol, 55; at Perth, 83; at Belfast, 96; in Shad Thames, 100; several at Liverpool, 108; in the London Docks, 109; several in London, 115; fatal fire in the Waterloo-road, 134; "Dr. Johnson's Club," in Ivy Lane, destroyed, 140; several disastrous fires in the rural districts,

Fires—*continued.*

148; the Hull theatre destroyed, 151; destructive fire in Wallbrook, 187; the Palace of Fredericksborg, Sweden, totally destroyed, 190; singular fire at Dublin, 190; fatal fire in Westminster, 192.

FRANCE.—Fire at the Palace of the Luxembourg, 159; trial of Madame Lemoine and her daughter for infanticide, at Tours, 196.

GENERAL ELECTION.—Eighteenth Parliament of the United Kingdom—Scotch Representative Peers, 500; Irish Representative Peers and Bishops, 500; List of Members returned to serve in Parliament for the several counties, cities, and boroughs; the unsuccessful candidates, and the state of the polls, 500.

Handel Commemoration.—Great festival in commemoration of the centenary of the death of Handel, 87.

HONOURS, 510.

INDIA:—

PROCLAMATION OF THE QUEEN IN COUNCIL to the princes, chiefs, and people of India, 203.

Telegrams from India—Jan. 1, defeat of Bainie Madho, 4; Feb. 16, defeat of Tantia Topee, 15; May 6, surrender of Maun Singh, capture of Tantia Topee, 60; May 19, trial and execution of Tantia Topee, 65; form of prayer and thanksgiving for our successes in India, 46; account of Tantia Topee, his trial and execution, 65; trial of the Nawab of Ferruckabad, 67; execution of Rajah Jeyloll Singh, 150.

IRELAND.—Renewal of agrarian murders and outrages in, 54; numerous murders in the autumn, 193.

ITALY, War in:—Unfriendly relations between Austria and Sardinia, [188]; reliance of Sardinia on France, growth of the Austrian influence in Italy contrary to the Treaties of Vienna, arrangement of the smaller states of Italy in 1815, treaties with Tuscany and Modena, [189, 190]; reception of the Austrian Minister by the French Emperor on New Year's Day, startling address to him, [191]; opening of the Sardinian Chambers, significant allusion to the state of Italy, [192]; marriage of Prince Napoleon to the daughter of the King of Sardinia, [192]; circular of Count Buol to the diplomatic agents of Austria, [193]; loan authorized by the Sardinian Chambers, [194]; circular of Count Cavour to the diplomatic agents

INDEX.

Italy—continued.

of Sardinia, stating grievances against Austria, [194]; speech of the Emperor at the opening of the French Chambers, [197]; on the application of the English Government Sardinia states her case against Austria, [199]; counter-statement of the Austrian Government, [203]; efforts of the Earl of Derby's Ministry to avert a war, instructions to Lord Cowley, our ambassador at Paris, [204]; Lord A. Loftus instructed to inform the Austrian Government of our determination to take no part in any war, [205]; the same instructions to our ministers at Rome and Florence, [206]; conversation between Count Buol and Lord A. Loftus, [207]; Lord Cowley sent on a confidential mission to Vienna, [208]; Russia proposes a congress, [210]; views of Sardinia and Austria on this question, [210, 211]; final effort of England to maintain peace, submits four propositions, [212]; attitude of Prussia, [213]; Austria summons Sardinia to disarm; reply of Count Cavour, [215]; proclamations of King Victor Emmanuel, [216]; emphatic remonstrance of the English Government against the Austrian summons, [217]; Sardinian constitution suspended and absolute powers confided to the King, [218]; statement of Count Walewski to the *corps législatif*, [218]; address of the Emperor of Austria to his army and people, [221]; Austrian circular to foreign powers, [223]; proclamation of the French commander at Rome, [226]; events in Tuscany, Parma, and Modena, [227]; the Austrian army crosses the Ticino, [229]; a French army enters Piedmont by land and sea, [229]; Count Walewski's circular vindicating the conduct of France, [230]; communication of the Emperor to the *corps législatif*, [231]; the Empress appointed Regent, [233]; policy of the British Government set forth in a despatch to Lord Cowley, [233]; the French Emperor's address to the army of Italy, [236]; position of the Austrian and Sardinian armies, [237]; military movements, battle of Montebello, [238]; retreat of the Austrians, combat at Palestro, the Austrians withdraw across the Ticino, [239]; battle of Magenta, [241]; the Emperor and the King of Sardinia enter Milan; the Emperor's proclamation to the people of Lombardy, [243]; Austrians driven out of Maleg-

Italy—continued.

nano, [244]; movements of Garibaldi, [245]; the Austrians retreat to the Minicio, [246]; diplomatic circular of the Russian government, [246]; advance of the allied armies, [247]; the battle of Solferino, [248]; the Austrians retire within the Quadrilateral, [250]; armistice signed at Villafranca, [250]; bases of the treaty of peace, [251]; proclamation of the Emperor Napoleon, [251]; manifesto of the Emperor of Austria, [252]; the plenipotentiaries meet at Zurich, [253]; disappointment of the Italians, display of feeling at Florence, [254]; the Emperor Napoleon returns to Paris, addresses presented to him, [255]; circular of the Papal Government, [257]; the Romagna throws off its allegiance to the Pope, [258]; deputations from Tuscany and Romagna to the King of Sardinia, [259]; letter from the Emperor Napoleon to the Pope, [260].

Telegrams of the War in.—Battle of Montebello, 68; battle of Palestro, 71; battle of Magenta, 78; battle of Solferino, 93; the armistice, 97; treaty of Villafranca, 99; estimated losses of the belligerents during the war, 99; preliminaries of peace signed at Villafranca, 223; treaty of Zurich, between Austria and France, 224; treaty of Zurich, between Austria, France, and Sardinia, 230.

Correspondence respecting the affairs of Italy, 236; statistics of Italy, 73.

JAPAN.—Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Commerce between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan, signed at Yedo, August 26, 1858, [268], 216.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS, Summary of, in ten years from 1850 to 1859, 310.

METEOROLOGY of the Year 1859, 310.

MINISTRY:—Of the Earl of Derby, as it stood at the meeting of Parliament, 373; of Viscount Palmerston, as it stood in the month of June, 374.

MISCELLANEOUS:—Wrecks in 1858, return of, 1; the weather, provisions, and population, in January, 2, 3; in June, 95; in July, 96, 103; 127, 128; in September, 149; in December, 199, 200; torture and execution of a French bishop in Tonquin, 6; centenary anniversary of the birth of Burns, 9; accouchement of the Princess Frederick William of Prussia, 10; baptism of the infant prince, 25; destruction of the Crinan canal, 12; the Gorilla, or

INDEX.

Miscellaneous—continued.

man-monkey, 13; shower of fish, 14; sale of the Hertz collection of gems, &c., 24; escape of Neapolitan exiles, 25; great earthquake at Quito, 29; reinterment of John Hunter, 33; cannibalism in the South Seas, 34; mysterious death at Ramsgate, 44; the Indian mutiny, form of prayer and thanksgiving, 46; Oxford and Cambridge boat-race, 50; the war and the money-market, 55; Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 56; the Albert Bridge at Saltash, 58; Limerick election, riots and loss of life, 60; the Red Sea telegraph, 69; extraordinary hail-storm, 70; fatal thunderstorm, 71; statistics of Italy, 73; Epsom races, 73; sale of works of art and vertu, the Gonzaga casket, 74; earthquake in Asia Minor, 77; distribution of the Victoria Cross, 80; the division on the Address, 81; Ascot races, 83; the two new marshals of France, 84; the Book of Common Prayer, the religious State services, 86; the Handel Festival, 87; political kidnapping in Chili, 91; sales of pictures; collection of Hon. E. Phipps, 92; paintings by Sir Joshua Reynolds, 93; thunderstorms in July, 96, 103; intense heat of July, 114; slave property in foreign countries, 97; losses of the belligerents in the war in Italy, 99; effects of the heat, 100; submarine telegraph to Denmark, 100; sale of Wordsworth's library, 104; strike of the builders, 105; Goodwood races, 108; explosion of a percussion-cap factory, 114; destruction of Walton Bridge, 123; fatal accident to an aeronaut, 124; aristocratic alliances, the Hon. William Denbigh Sloper Harrison, 124; religious disturbances at St. George's-in-the-East, 125; thunder-storm, house struck by lightning, 127; sale of the "properties" of Vauxhall Gardens, 127; capture of Schamyl, the Circassian chief, 128; brilliant aurora borealis, 128; Indian and Russian loans, 129; sale of Lord Northwick's pictures, 130; extraordinary performances of M. Blondin at Niagara, 132; Doncaster races, 135; the *Great Eastern*, her first voyage, dreadful explosion, 136; extraordinary child-stealing at Paris, 141; fate of Sir John Franklin's expedition, 143; explosion of a percussion-cap factory, 21 lives lost, 145; the championship of the Thames, 147; aquatic victories on the Seine, 147; English cricketers in America,

Miscellaneous—continued.

148; death of Charles XII. of Sweden, 149; execution of Rajah Jeyloll Sing, 150; the great bell of the new palace at Westminster, 150; the Glasgow waterworks opened by the Queen, 151; disastrous gales in October, 156, 166; the Channel Squadron, 156; the University of Edinburgh, election of a President, 159; desperate encounter with convicts on board the *Ararat*, 160; Roman Britain—*Uriconium*, or Wroxeter, 164; Schiller centenary anniversary, 168; launch of H.M.S. *Victoria*, 121 guns, 168; mutiny in a line-of-battle ship, 169; remarkable lunar phenomena, 171; sale of majolica ware, 171; poisonings by mistake, 172; unlucky theft, several boys poisoned, 172; sale of Lord Northwick's coins, 181; scandal in high life, *Bell v. Marquess of Anglesey*, 183; murders on board American ships, 184; £40,000 damages, *Penhallow v. the Mersey Docks*, 187; "Guilty" or "Not Guilty," 191; fatal military riot in Aldershot camp, 192; more gales and shipwrecks, 195; the Lemoine infanticide, 196; poisoned confectionery, 198; the weather and the parks, 199; the weather of the quarter, 200; railway and steamboat disasters in America, 201; accidents on railways during the year, 202.

MORTALITY, TABLE OF, in England and Wales, and in the Metropolis, in the year 1859, 310.

Murders and Suicides.—Murder of a French bishop in Tonquin, 6; murder, suicide, and arson, at Manchester, 10; extraordinary murder in the United States, case of Mr. Sickles, 20; fatal jealousy, murder, and suicide, at West-bromwich, 31; mysterious death of a foreigner at Ramsgate, 44; singular suicide of a Spanish gentleman in Blenheim Park, 48; double murder and suicide in St. Pancras, 84; murder and suicide at Stoke Newington, 122; double infanticide and suicide, 151; murder and suicide in Gloucestershire, 173; dreadful wife murder by a madman in Shoreditch, 175; double suicide in the City-road, 180; murders on board American ships, 184; the Lemoine infanticide in France, 196.

Murders in Ireland.—Of Thomas Jessop, in Westmeath; in Wexford, 54; dreadful murders in Ireland by a police-constable—the Dunganannon tragedy

INDEX.

Murders in Ireland—*continued*.

181; revival of Ribbon murders and outrages, 193.

[See TRIALS AND LAW CASES.]

NAPLES.—Singular escape of Neapolitan exiles, 25.

PARLIAMENT, THE:—The Session opened by the Queen in person; Her Majesty's Speech: it contains a special reference to Parliamentary Reform, [3]; in the House of Lords, address moved by Earl of Winchelsea, seconded by Lord Ravensworth, [5]; Earl Granville opens a general discussion of public affairs, and asks a statement of the foreign policy of Ministers, [6]; the Earl of Derby, after touching on general topics, explains his foreign policy, especially as regards Italy, [7]; observations of Earl Grey, Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Brougham, and Earl of Carlisle, address agreed to, [10]. In the House of Commons, address moved by Mr. Trefusis, and seconded by Mr. Beecroft, [10]; Lord Palmerston discusses the subject of foreign affairs, Austria and Sardinia, and asks explanation of Government measure of Parliamentary Reform, [10]; answered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Disraeli) that a Reform Bill is prepared; efforts of the Government to preserve peace; maintains the alliance with France, [11]; Lord John Russell's strong remarks on the position of Austria in Italy, and on Reform, [11]; address agreed to, [12].

The Solicitor-General introduces bills for the improvement of the law of real property; his exposition of the measure, which is approved by Sir R. Bethell and Mr. Lowe, [12]; but denounced by Lord St. Leonards in the Lords, [13]; in committee the bill is opposed by Mr. Malins; general discussion, [14]; the bill stopped by the dissolution, [15]; Lord Palmerston raises a discussion on the general state of affairs on the Continent, [15]; the Chancellor of the Exchequer states his anticipations of the preservation of peace, and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Italy, [16]; affair of the *Charles et Georges*; Lord Wodehouse moves for the production of papers; motion answered by Earl of Malmesbury, [17]; debate, Earl Granville, [18]; Lord Kingsdown, [18]; Earl Grey, [19]; Earl of Derby, [19]; motion withdrawn, [20]; subject brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Kinglake; his elaborate speech,

Parliament—*continued*.

[20]; answered by Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, [21]; debate, Mr. Lowe, [22]; Mr. Bovill, [22]; Lord J. Russell, [23]; the Solicitor-General, [23]; debate adjourned and not renewed. Important debate in the Lords on the right of search, [24].

Navy Estimates.—Exposition by Sir J. Pakington of the state of the navy, and the measures of the Government to restore our naval supremacy; comparison of the English and French navies, [27]; general observations of Sir C. Wood, Sir C. Napier, and others, [28].

Army Estimates.—Introduced by General Peel, [29].

Indian Finance.—Lord Stanley's elaborate exposition of the debt, revenues, and financial resources of India; proposes loan of £7,000,000, [30]; general discussion in committee; speech of Sir C. Wood, [32]; Mr. V. Smith, [33]; Mr. Lowe, [34]; Indian Loan Bill brought in; adverse speech of Sir G. Lewis, [34]; Mr. Bright, Mr. Ayrton, [35]; Mr. Wilson, Lord Stanley, Sir E. Parry, [36]; the subject raised in the Lords by Earl of Ellenborough; answer of the Earl of Derby, [37]; bill passed.

Law of Marriage.—Lord Bury introduces bill to legalize marriage with sister of deceased wife, which passes the Commons, [38]; strongly opposed in the House of Lords; second reading moved by Lord Wodehouse; Lord Duncannon moves its rejection, [39]; speeches of Earl of Albemarle, [39]; the Bishop of Exeter, Lord St. Leonards, Bishop of St. Asaph, Lord Liford, Lord Cranworth, Bishop of Cork, [40]; Bishops of Oxford and Carlisle; second reading negatived, [41].

Church Rates.—Sir J. Trelawney's bill for total abolition of Church-rates, [41]; Mr. Alcock introduces a measure; Mr. Walpole introduces, on behalf of the Government, a measure for settling the question, [42]; on second reading of the Government bill, speech of Sir G. Grey, [44]; after animated discussion, second reading negatived, [45]; Sir A. H. Elton proposes resolutions which are withdrawn, [45]; second reading of Sir J. Trelawney's bill; amendment of Mr. D. Griffith, [46]; after an animated debate, second reading carried by a large majority, [48].

Roman Catholic Oaths.—Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald moves for a committee to in-

INDEX.

Parliament—*continued.*

quire into the oaths taken by Roman Catholic members under the Relief Act, [48]; motion deprecated by Mr. Adams, Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Walpole, supported by Mr. C. Fortescue, Lord J. Russell, Mr. Maguire, and Mr. V. Smith; motion carried; bill ordered to be brought in, [50]; these bills stopped by the dissolution.

Parliamentary Reform.—Expectations in regard to the Ministerial measure; the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduces the bill on the 28th of February; his long and able exposition, [48]; remarks of Lord John Russell, [55]; Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Bright, and others, [56]; Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley announce their retirement from the Ministry on the ground of difference of opinion with respect to the franchise, [56—58]; Lord J. Russell gives notice of amendment for greater extension of the franchise; concessions of the Ministry, [60]; debate of seven nights on the second reading; Lord J. Russell's speech on moving his amendment, [61]; Lord Stanley's answer on behalf of Government, [64]; speeches of Mr. Horsman, [65]; Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, [66]; Mr. Sidney Herbert, [67]; the Solicitor-General, [68]; Mr. Walpole, [69]; Mr. Bright, [71]; Sir S. Northcote, [72]; Mr. Cardwell, [73]; Lord Palmerston, [74]; Mr. Whiteside, [75]; Sir James Graham, [76]; Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Gladstone, [77]; Sir R. Peel, Mr. Henley, [79]; Mr. Roebuck; the Chancellor of the Exchequer's answer on behalf of the Ministry, [80]; second reading *negatived* by majority of 39, [82]; Earl of Derby announces the course he intends to pursue, viz., to have recourse to an immediate dissolution, [82]; the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes the same statement in the House of Commons, [84]; Lord Stanley announces the necessity of a further Indian loan; discussion thereon, [87]; important discussion on the negotiations respecting Italy in the House of Lords, [88]; in the House of Commons, [92]; the necessary financial arrangements being completed, Parliament is prorogued on the 19th April and immediately dissolved; Speech of the Lords Commissioners, [95].

The general election, 500; Scotch representative peers, 500; Irish representative peers and bishops, 500; list of

Parliament—*continued.*

members returned for the several counties, cities, and boroughs; the unsuccessful candidates, and the state of the polls, 500.

The new Parliament meets on 31st May; re-election of the Speaker, [98]; the session opened by the Queen in person; Her Majesty's Speech, [100]; in the Lords, address moved by Earl Powis, seconded by Lord Lifford; Earl Granville's comments on the position and policy of the Ministry, [101]; debate, chiefly on the conduct of foreign affairs; answer of the Earl of Derby, [104]; address agreed to; in the Commons, the address chosen as the point whereon to test the strength of parties; address moved by Mr. Egerton, seconded by Sir J. Elphinstone; the Marquis of Hartington moves amendment of want of confidence in the Ministry, [105]; the Chancellor of the Exchequer's reply on the amendment, [106]; three nights' debate; speeches of Mr. Wilson, [107]; Lord Palmerston, Serjeant Deasy, Mr. S. Fitzgerald, [108]; Mr. Bright, [109]; Lord Ashley, Mr. Horsman, Mr. K. Seymour, [110]; Sir J. Graham, Mr. Whiteside, [111]; Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. S. Herbert, [112]; Sir G. Lewis, Sir J. Pakington, [114]; Lord J. Russell, Mr. Roebuck, the Solicitor-General, [115]; division—for amendment 323, against 310, majority against Ministers 13—[116]; the Ministers announce their resignation in both houses; Ministerial explanations, [116]; new Ministry formed by Lord Palmerston; in the Lords, Earl Granville makes a statement of their intended policy, [118]; in the Commons Lord Palmerston makes similar statement, [120]; discussion on the defence of the country, [121]; the same subject raised in the Lords, [122]; speech of Lord Lyndhurst, [123]; of Earl Granville, [125]; of Earl of Hardwicke, Duke of Somerset, [126]; Earl of Ellenborough, [127]; discussion in the Commons on volunteer rifle corps, [127]; views of the Government expressed by Mr. S. Herbert, the Secretary of War, [128]; select committee to inquire into army organization appointed, [129]; the Secretary of the Admiralty, in moving the navy estimates, makes a statement respecting our naval force, [129]; measures for the defence of the country; the Reserve Force of

INDEX.

Parliament—continued.

Seamen Bill, [130]; the Secretary of War, in moving the army estimates, states our military preparations, [131]; Sir De L. Evans' motion for a committee on national defences, [132]; the subject renewed by Mr. Horsman, [133]; debate thereon, [134]; Lord Lyndhurst defends his previous statements, [136]; discussion on the militia laws, [136].

Church Rates.—Sir J. Trelawney re-introduces his bill for their total abolition, [139]; Sir G. Lewis states the views of the Ministry, [139]; speech of Mr. H. Drummond, [140]; Lord Palmerston, [141]; Mr. Disraeli, Lord J. Russell, [142]; second reading agreed to; amendment moved by Mr. Newdegate on committee, [143]; the subject discussed in the Lords on motion of Duke of Marlborough, [144].

Endowed Schools.—Bill for opening endowed schools to Dissenters; speeches of Sir S. Northcote, the Attorney-General, [145]; Sir H. Cairns, Mr. Mellor, Sir G. Grey, [146]; Lord J. Manners; bill read second time and referred to select committee, [147].

Roman Catholic Disabilities.—Bill to enable Roman Catholics to be Lord Chancellors in Ireland, introduced by Sir W. Somerville; debate thereon, [147].

Revision of the Liturgy.—Important discussion in the Lords on a petition for revision of the Church services, [149].

Finance.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Gladstone) makes his financial statement; his speech, [150]; Mr. Disraeli, on Committee of Ways and Means, reviews the financial condition of the country and the aspect of foreign affairs, [153]; answered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, [155]; speeches of Mr. Bright, Lord J. Russell, Lord Palmerston, [156]; the financial propositions adopted, [158]; the Secretary for India (Sir C. Wood) makes a statement of the financial condition and prospects of India, [158]; views of Lord Stanley, [160]; of Mr. Bright, [161].

Indian Loan Bill.—Discussion in both houses on the question of an imperial guarantee, and on the appointment of a Financial Minister for India, [164].

The Indian Army.—Sir C. Wood introduces a bill to fix the limits of

Parliament—continued.

European troops in India; important discussion on the general subject, [165].

Foreign Affairs—the War in Italy.

—The war repeatedly the subject of discussion in Parliament; in the Lords, Earl Granville declares a policy of neutrality; observations of Earl of Malmesbury and other peers, [168]; in the Commons, Lord Palmerston states his views, [169]; on news of the armistice, pending discussions postponed, [170]; Lord J. Russell (Secretary for Foreign Affairs) makes a statement respecting the condition of foreign affairs and the policy of the Government, [172]; observations of Mr. Disraeli, [175]; of Lord Palmerston, [176]; Chancellor of Exchequer, [177]; discussion in the Commons on our foreign relations; answer of Lord Palmerston, [178]; again in both houses, [179]; Lord Elcho's motion respecting affairs of Italy; interesting debate, [180]; speech of the Chancellor of Exchequer, [181]; Mr. S. FitzGerald, [182]; Mr. Horsman, Mr. S. Herbert, [183]; Lord J. Russell, Mr. Disraeli, [184]; the Estimates having been passed, Parliament is prorogued by Commission on the 13th August; Speech of the Lords Commissioners, [185].

The Division on the 10th June—the largest on record; comparison with large divisions on previous occasions, CHRONICLE, 81.

PATENTS.—528.

POETRY.—545.

PROMOTIONS.—518.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.—Proclamation by the Queen in Council to the princes, chiefs, and people of India, 203.

Treaties.—Treaty between Her Majesty and the Emperor of China (treaty of Tien-tsin), 206; treaty between Her Majesty and the Tycoon of Japan, 216; convention between Her Majesty and the Republic of Guatemala relative to the boundary of British Honduras, 221.

Italy.—Preliminaries of Villafranca, 223; treaty of Zurich between Austria and France, 224; treaty of Zurich between Austria, France, and Sardinia, 230.

State Papers.—Correspondence respecting the affairs of Italy, 236.

Documents respecting the Defence of the Country.—Act for establishing a

INDEX.

Public Documents—continued.

reserve volunteer force of seamen, 258; act for establishing a reserve force of men who have been in Her Majesty's service, 261; volunteer rifle corps, circular establishing, 262; flogging in the army, 264; flogging in the navy, 265.

Despatches.—Despatch of Admiral Hope detailing the action at the mouth of the Peiho, 267; Chinese official account of the same, 273.

List of Acts, 22 Vict., 276; ditto, 22 and 23 Vict., 280; *Finance Accounts* for the year 1859, 290.

QUEEN, THE.—Accouchement of the Princess Frederick William of Prussia, 10; baptism of the infant prince at Berlin, 25; distribution of the Victoria Cross by Her Majesty, 80; autumnal residence of the Court at Balmoral, 133; Her Majesty opens the Glasgow water-works at Loch Katrine, 151.

Quito, terrible earthquake in, 29.

RACING MEETINGS.—Epsom, 73; Ascot, 83; Goodwood, 108; Doncaster, 135.

Railway Accidents:—On the North-Western railway, near Leamington, 18; terrible railway accidents in America, on the Great Western of Canada, at Chicago, on the Michigan Southern, 28; at the Grove Lake Viaduct, Cornwall railway, 60; on the Bangor and Carnarvon railway, 68; on the London and Blackwall railway, 116; on the Great Northern railway, near Hitchin, 135; on the South-Coast railway, 177; railway and steamboat disasters in America, 201; return of railway accidents in the year 1859, 202.

RUSSIA.—Capture of Schamyl, the Circassian chief, 128.

Sales of Pictures, Coins, and Articles of Vertu.—Sale of the Hertz collection of gems, &c., 24; of works of art and vertu—the Gonzaga casket, &c., 74; of pictures of the Hon. E. Phipps, Mr. Windus, and others; fine specimens of Sir Joshua Reynolds, 92; of Wordsworth's library, 104; of Lord Northwick's gallery of pictures, 130; of his coins, 181; sale of Majolica ware, 171.

SHERIFFS FOR THE YEAR 1859, 375.

Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea.—Return of wrecks for the year 1858, 1; wreck of the *Czar*, steam-ship, 14 lives lost, 8; collision of the *Prince Patrick* and the *Elgin*, five lives lost, 15; explosion of the *Black Eagle* at

Shipwrecks, &c.—continued.

Cardiff, 16; loss of H.M.'s gun-boat *Jaseur*, 18; accident to the Calais packet *Prince Frederick William*, 19; the Dutch barque *Equator* burnt, 29; accident and rescue of the *Indian Queen*, gold ship, 39; steamboat disasters in America, the *St. Nicholas*, *Nathaniel Holmes*, *David Gibson*, 52; dreadful wreck of the *Pomona*, 386 lives lost, 52; wreck of H.M.S. *Heron*, many lives lost, 60; destruction of the *Eastern Monarch* by fire, 74; wreck of the *Alma*, merchant-ship, many persons drowned, 77; wreck of the Indian mail-steamer *Alma* in the Red Sea, 81; wreck of the *Argo* mail-steamer, 94; wreck of the West-Indian mail-steamer *Paramatta*, 95; wreck of the *Silistria*, many persons drowned, 109; wreck of the *Blenheim*, Indianman, the *Shepherdess*, *Eliza Bain*, *Josephine*, *Glance*, 115; wreck of the *Admella*, (Australia), dreadful sufferings of the passengers and crew, 121; fatal collision, the *Ondine* steamer and the *Robert Garden*, 122; the *Great Eastern*, her first voyage, dreadful explosion on board, 136; wreck of the *Express*, Jersey packet, 142; wreck of the *Royal Charter*, 459 lives lost, 152; desperate encounter with convicts on board the *Ararat*, 160; appalling shipwrecks, 1200 coolies lost; the *Shah Jehan* and the *Flora Temple*, 163; numerous wrecks during the November gales, 166; wreck of the *Indian*, mail-steamer, 172; fatal collision in the Clyde, the *Eagle* and the *Pladda*, 177; murders on board American ships, 184; dreadful wreck of the *Blerrie Castle*, with all on board, 195; numerous wrecks during the December gales, 195.

STATE PAPERS.—Correspondence respecting the affairs of Italy, 236. See **PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.**

STATUTES, Table of all the, 22 Vict., 276; ditto, 22 & 23 Vict., 280.

TREATIES. See **PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.**

TRIALS AND LAW CASES.—*Criminal causes:* The **RICHMOND POISONING CASE**, 340; The **POPLAR POISONING CASE**, 364; The Queenborough murder, trial of Frederick Prentice for murder of Emma Coppins, 27; wife-murder at Rye, trial of John White, 29; trial of Mary Jones for child-murder, 34; dreadful poaching murders, trial of Thomas Brown for murder of William Watmore, 37; of seven poachers for

INDEX.

Trials and Law Cases—*continued*.

murder of J. W. Jex, a gamekeeper, 37; of three poachers for murder of James Eatough, a game-watcher, 38; the Doddington murder, trial of Bolton and Danks for murder of Maddox and Beach, two gamekeepers, 39; trial of a mate of the *Bogota* for roasting a stoker to death, 40; detection of a great gang of bank forgers, trial of Wagner, Bateman, and others, 61; trial of William Adams for the murder of Martha Page, 86; charge against the captain of the *Louisa Brassington* for "deporting" political prisoners from Chili, 91; numerous trials for arson, 100; the Aldershott murder, trial of Haynes for the murder of a girl, 101; wife-murder at Hull, trial of John Riley, 102; trial of four men for brutally outraging and murdering a woman at Tipton, 107; wife-murder, trial of William Worsey, 108; trial of J. S. Withew for the murder of his wife at Jarrow, 111; trial of Carey and Pickett for the murder of William Stevenson at Stickney, 112; the Ledbury murder, trial of Jones for murder of Harriet Baker, 116; trial of Francis for murder of his wife at Newport, 120; aristocratic alliances, trial of the Hon. William Denbigh Sloper Marshall Harrison, for bigamy, 124; extensive robberies of bank-notes, 134; extraordinary child-stealing at Paris, 141; murder on the high seas, trial of Francisco Guimaraens for the murder of his captain, 157; singular case of conspiracy at Glasgow, 162; poisoning by mistake at Canterbury, 172; dreadful murder by a madman in Shoreditch, 175; cruel child-murder by a step-mother, trial of Sarah Jane Wiggins, 178; murders on board Americanships, trial of J. W. Moody, 184; abominable outrages, trial of four men for rape at Halifax, 186; the Roundhay murder, trial of Charles Normington for the murder of Richard Broughton at Leeds, 188; the Coventry wife-

Trials and Law Cases—*continued*.

murder, trial of John Kingston—the plea of "Guilty" or "Not Guilty," 191; the Lemoine infanticide, trial of Victorine and Angeline Lemoine, at Tours, 196.

Civil causes.—The Shrewsbury Estates—The EARL OF SHREWSBURY *v.* SCOTT AND OTHERS, 317; THE THELLUSSON WILL CASE, 333; *Black v. Elliott*, wholesale sheep poisoning, 23; scandal in high life, *Bell v. Marquis of Anglesea*, £10,000 damages, 183; *Penhallow v. the Mersey Docks*, £40,000 damages, 187; *Santos v. Illidge*, slave property in foreign countries, 97.

UNIVERSITY HONOURS. — Oxford, 311; Cambridge, 314.

UNITED STATES.—The President's Message: Slavery, 269; African slave trade, 270; China, 272; foreign relations, Island of San Juan, 274; Mexico, 276; refusal of supplies, 277; finance, 278.

Extraordinary murder at Washington by Mr. Sickles, 20; terrible railway accidents in, at Chicago, and on the Michigan Southern, 28; railway and steamboat disasters in, 1853 to 1859, 201.

Weather, the: — In January; price of provisions and population, 2; the winter quarter, 3; extraordinary hail-storm, 70; fatal thunderstorm in May, 71; the spring quarter, 95; thunderstorms in July, 96, 103; effects of the heat in July, 100; the hot weather, 114; thunderstorm in August, 127; brilliant *Aurora Borealis*, 128; the summer quarter, 149; disastrous gales in October, wreck of the *Royal Charter*, 152; the channel squadron, 156; storms and shipwrecks in November, 166; remarkable lunar phenomena, 171; gales and shipwrecks in December, the *Blervie Castle*, 195; the weather and the parks, 199; the autumn quarter, 200; meteorological table for the year, 310.

203794

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW**

**BOOKS REQUESTED BY ANOTHER BORROWER
ARE SUBJECT TO RECALL AFTER ONE WEEK.
RENEWED BOOKS ARE SUBJECT TO
IMMEDIATE RECALL**

LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

D4613 (12/76)



3 1175 00976 7735

